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This study focused on associate degree programs in public administration offered by U.S. public community and junior colleges. Public administration has been defined as the study of the process, policies and programs of government. According to Mosher (1978), the study and teaching of public administration has taken place since 1888 in U.S. higher education. From the 1920s to date, graduate and undergraduate degree programs in public administration have been in operation in United States colleges and universities.

According to the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA), public community and junior colleges in the U.S. have been offering associate degrees and certificates in public administration since 1972. Peterson’s Two Year Colleges (2002) reported in the 2000-2001 academic year, 42 public community and junior colleges in 22 states offered associate degree programs in public administration. However, during inquiries made for this study in December of 2002, only 20 public community and junior colleges in 15 states reported that they offered an associate degree program in public administration.

This study provided new empirical data about U.S. public community and junior college public administration associate degree programs based on results of a telephone survey that was administered to 20 program directors of the associate degree programs in public administration in U.S. public community and junior colleges. The data indicated that certain curriculum subject areas are being emphasized in associate degree programs in public administration. The research from this study revealed that graduates with an associate degree in public administration are working in various kinds of positions in private and public sectors of the U.S. labor economy; i.e. federal, state and local government organizations. The data also suggested that there are a number of changes that are positively and negatively affecting associate degree programs in public
administration that are offered by U.S. public community and junior colleges; i.e. demographic changes in student population and increases in student enrollment.

This study’s conceptual framework’s aspects of the division of labor, articulation and accreditation is discussed as to how those aspects relate to and are affected by the offering of associate degree programming in public administration by U.S. public community and junior colleges.

This study concludes by offering recommendations on how U.S. community and junior colleges can utilize this study and its results for informational and evaluative purposes to institute a new program in public administration or to assess their current associate degree program in public administration.

Recommendations have been made for NASPAA about the results of this study, and how they can use those results for their own research and reference purposes. Lastly, several recommendations for further research have been made based on the data that were derived from this study about associate degree programs in public administration that are offered by U.S. public community colleges and junior colleges.
Mosher (1978) said that, “public administration traditionally defined, comprises those activities involved in carrying out the policies and programs of government” (p. 4). Public administration has been recognized as an ancient activity. According to Mosher, the earliest records on the activities of civilized organizations in China, Egypt, and India make reference to what is now known as public administration.

Mosher (1978) stated that the study and practice of public administration have taken place since 1888 in U.S. higher education and government settings. From the 1920s to date, graduate and undergraduate degree programs in public administration have been in operation in U.S. colleges and universities.

According to the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA), public community and junior colleges in the U.S., since 1972, have been offering associate degrees and certificates in public administration. Peterson’s Two-Year Colleges (2002) reported that during the 2000-2001 academic year, 42 public community and junior colleges in 22 states offered associate degree programs in public administration.

During the 1995-2005 decade, The Chronicle of Higher Education has reported changes in student enrollments due to demographic trends that caused both two-year and four-year colleges to seek new ways and means to attract students. Diversification of program offerings has been one of the strategies and approaches that two-year colleges have used to attract new students. With respect to enrollment increases, leveling off or reductions in public administration programs, several questions come to mind: What is the current state of associate degree programs in public administration? How is the associate degree in public administration being used in the public service sector? And, what changes are affecting associate degree programs in public administration?
Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study were to: (a) provide new empirical data about certain aspects of associate degree programs in public administration that are offered by U.S. community and junior colleges, (b) determine the emphasis of associate degree programming in public administration and how the associate degree in public administration is being utilized, and (c) determine what changes were taking place in associate degree programs in public administration offered by U.S. public community and junior colleges.

Research Questions

The following research questions were answered with regard to the purposes of this study:

1. What niches or groups of the public sector are being primarily served by graduates of associate degree programs in public administration?
2. What curriculum subject areas are emphasized in associate degree programs in public administration?
3. In what kinds of public service positions are associate degree graduates in public administration employed?
4. What changes are taking place in associate degree programs in public administration that are offered by U.S. public community colleges and junior colleges?

Significance of the Study

During the past decade, 1995-2005, according to the U.S. Census Bureau (2003), the United States in general and specifically the southern and western regions of the country (e.g., Arizona, California, Florida, and Texas) experienced rapid growth in population, business, and government (Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 2004).

For example, according to the U.S. Census Bureau (2003), Florida’s population was 17,019,068, which put Florida as the fourth largest state in the United States. Florida continues to grow rapidly and its population is becoming
more diverse, older, and transient.

Klay (1999) claimed that by 2010 the number of students seeking admittance to the State of Florida’s higher education system could double. “Most will be undergraduates and the attention of policy has been shifting toward undergraduate education” (p. 268). Klay (1999) said that despite Florida’s population growth, coupled with “increases in the number of students wanting to attend the State’s institutions of higher education; Florida will remain . . . among the bottom ten states in per capita expenditures” (p. 268). Florida is also “close to 50th in per pupil expenditures on higher education . . . yet the demand for educated public administrators in a growing state is likely to be strong” (p. 268).

The Chronicle of Higher Education Almanac (2004) indicated that there were more than 3,958 postsecondary institutions in the U.S. Public two-year community colleges and junior colleges accounted for approximately 1,081 of the 3,547 postsecondary institutions in the U.S. It was also reported that 3,323 associate degrees in public administration were awarded during academic year 2001 - 2002. Of those, 468 were awarded to men and 2,855 to women.

A certain amount of duplication of academic programming may be acceptable to educational institutions. However, it is important for postsecondary institutions to realize that it might be best to avoid further growth and redundancy of programs if it is shown that the number of graduates in a given professional program exceeds available job openings in their intended professional field.

Therefore, the primary emphasis of this study was to provide academicians, researchers, and practitioners in the field of public administration with an expanded database of new information about associate degree programs in public administration. This was derived from survey research on U.S. public administration education in public community and junior colleges at the associate degree level.

Definitions

As used in this study, these terms were given the following meanings:
Articulation - A legally based policy, rule, or underwritten consent agreement between two-year colleges and four-year colleges or universities that allows for two-year college graduates with associate degrees to transfer as juniors into four-year colleges or universities, i.e., the State of Florida’s 2 + 2 program (Bender lecture notes, 1982).

Associate Degree - A two-year academic degree that is awarded traditionally by community colleges or junior colleges to a student who satisfactorily completes 60 to 65 semester hours in a general education or career education program of study (College Blue Book, 1995).

Division of Labor - The social and economic value relationship that is characterized as an interdependent, interlocking, systematic collective function of a civilized society (Jones, 1986).

Goals - Philosophic statements toward which the action of the organization is directed (Blackburn, 1979).

Objectives - Statements of concrete outcomes that are expected to be achieved within a specified time frame (Blackburn, 1979).

Public Administration - The study of the process, policies, and programs of government.

Assumptions

The study assumed that there were employment opportunities available for associate degree holders in public administration. One further assumption was that some students with associate degrees in public administration ultimately transfer to four-year programs.

Limitations

The scope of this study was limited to those publicly supported, two-year community and junior colleges in the U.S. that were listed in Peterson’s Two Year Colleges (2002). The study also was limited to perceptions of the respondents, the data yielded by the instrument, and documents provided by the colleges.
Related Literature

There have been numerous studies about public administration education using survey research techniques. This type of research in public administration education has focused on varying aspects and issues of undergraduate and graduate degree programming in public administration. Three research studies are particularly relevant and related to this study.

Bana and Emory (1998) reported on the general role and responsibilities of community colleges, community college students, types of degrees, programs and courses offered in public administration, and how many degrees in public administration were awarded in 1995. The article explained Northern Virginia’s experience in implementing a certificate program in public administration in order to comply with the Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act. The authors described how the college was then able to capitalize by entering into an agreement with the U.S. Defense Logistics Agency Headquarters, so agency employees could pursue a certificate in public administration.

Bana and Emory’s (1998) article was a descriptive, reflective, generalized restatement report that was derived from reference sources like College Blue Book, (1995). Nevertheless, the authors called for more attention to community college programming in public administration despite certain challenges.

Bana and Emory (1998) stated that the following challenges were besetting community colleges. Community colleges are often overlooked as a source of public administration education. There is a need to provide a “straightforward and seamless transfer program” (p. 225). Another challenge is finding appropriate resources such as textbooks and support materials, as well as journals and databases. The authors concluded that community colleges are the place for providing entry-level public administration education training to “the vast cadre of operation-level public employees” (p. 225).

Swain (1985) studied private and public institutions offering bachelor degree programs in public administration. He mailed out survey forms to 71 undergraduate institutions listed in the 1983-1984 National Association of
Schools for Public Affairs and Administration’s (NASPAA) Directory. Forty-three completed survey forms were returned. This constituted a 61% response rate. The conclusions reached from Swain’s study were that a variety existed within a foundation of commonality as to type of degree awarded (B.S. versus B.A.), organizational structure, and curriculum choices.

Daniels and Johansen (1987) studied accreditation and the perceptions of program directors of master degree programs. “The Council of Postsecondary Accreditation, in October of 1986, approved the NASPAA application for recognition as an accrediting organization” (p. 79).

Daniels and Johansen (1987) sent out questionnaires to 310 directors or coordinators of master degree programs in public affairs and administration who were listed as NASPAA members or listed in Peterson’s *Annual Guide to Graduate Study*. The authors obtained a 49% response rate of 151 completed questionnaires. The issues that were presented for the directors’ responses concerned whether the program directors approved of NASPAA becoming an accrediting agency, the effects of accreditation on educational programs, and some demographic questions. Daniels and Johansen said the significance of their study’s findings was that “more directors approved than disapproved of NASPAA becoming an accrediting agency, with a majority of directors believing that accreditation would increase public sector professionalism” (p. 84).

Based on the review of previously published related research, no survey research studies had been published that addressed the purpose and research questions of this study.

**Implications for Practice**

This research can assist academicians, researchers, and practitioners in the field of public administration with an expanded database of new information derived from survey research about public administration education in U.S. public community and junior colleges at the associate degree level.

Additional uses for this study include the offering of never-reported and newly reported data about associate degree programming in public
administration to the American Society for Public Administration and the National Association of Schools for Public Affairs and Administration that may be utilized for their own respective research and reference purposes. U.S. community and junior colleges may utilize this study and its results for informational and evaluative purposes, whether they plan to institute a new associate degree program in public administration or assess their current associate degree program in public administration.
Chapter 2
Review of Related Literature

The review of the literature is organized by the following topics: history, ideological constructs, study and practice, academic and organizational responsibility, curriculum, degrees offered, summary, foremost issues of the field, and other issues.

History

According to Stone and Stone (1975) the study and practice of public administration education in the U.S. began more than 100 years ago as a result of certain social, economic, and political events of the late 19th and 20th centuries. The U.S. was reeling from the economic depression of the 1870s, the assassination of President Garfield, the passage of the Pendleton Act that reformed the U.S. Civil Service and cases of widespread political corruption in local, state, and federal levels of U.S. government.

Stone and Stone (1975) stated that the events of the 1870s and 1880s served as the seed bed that caused academicians, business leaders, citizens’ reform groups, and governmental officials to seek new ways and means to instill ethical, efficient, and economical practices in American governmental administration. Leaders of American higher education and government responded by articulating the need to develop an academic course of study that would provide specialized professional training for careers in public service in federal, state, and local governments of the U.S. (p. 11).

According to Blunt (1989), institutions of higher education in the U.S. began to offer courses in public administration in the late 1800s and early 1900s. The University of Pennsylvania began teaching public administration in 1881, Columbia University in 1888, the University of California at Berkeley in 1882, Harvard University in 1900, and the University of Illinois in 1909, were cited by Blunt as being the first institutions of higher education that offered course work in public administration.
Stone and Stone (1975) reported that the first professional school of public administration was started in 1912 by the New York Bureau of Municipal Research. The purpose of the school was to survey, study, and offer solutions for better management of city business. In the same year Charles Beard of Columbia University reported to the American Political Science Association Committee on Practical Training, of which he was a member, that the New York Bureau of Municipal Research’s “. . . Training School is equal in discipline and academics to a year spent in any university” (p. 29).

Stone and Stone (1975) reported that the American Political Science Association Committee on Practical Training for Public Service issued a report in 1913, recommending that universities establish contacts with government. The authors stated that “unfortunately, the committee found no group of public employees concerned about their training and no interested public authority. World War I also diverted attention” (p. 29).

It was during the 1920s and 1930s that public administration began to be recognized as a legitimate separate field of study in higher education in the United States. This was due to the efforts of many, including Leonard D. White, author of *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration* (1926), the first textbook on the subject of public administration, who envisioned public administration as a separate field of study (Blunt, 1989). By 1933, 25 colleges and universities had announced new programs in public administration. Due to the many new social and economic government-sponsored programs that were being developed and implemented in the 1930s by Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal legislation, public administration education prospered.

According to Stone and Stone (1975), in conjunction with the growth and development in universities of programming in public administration, universities sponsored the formation of municipal and legislative reference research bureaus, the purpose of which was to collect and publish information about state and local governments. Fourteen university-governmental research agencies were operating in the 1930s, they were: University of California, University of Cincinnati, University of Colorado, Columbia University, University of Florida,
Harvard University, University of Kansas, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, University of North Carolina, University of Oklahoma, West Virginia University, and University of Wisconsin. As a result of combining research bureaus with university programs, Stone and Stone reported that:

The fourfold role of comprehensive schooling in public administration emerged: (a) to provide pre-service and in-service professional education of graduate quality, (b) to upgrade skills of public employees through short courses, (c) to engage in research to produce theory and applied knowledge for both teaching purposes and operational guidance, and (d) to provide advisory assistance and information to governments. (p. 34)

According to Blunt (1989), in 1939, the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) was established independent of the American Political Science Association (APSA). The purpose of ASPA was to promote the study and practice of public administration. Blunt stated that “the American Society for Public Administration, like other academic organizations before it, helped to legitimize a developing academic discipline” (p. 620). It was the Committee on Practical Training for Public Service that ASPA had evolved from and through ASPA’s activities of “. . . publishing journals and convening conferences, it has had an impact on the content of courses and curriculum throughout the nation” (p. 621).

Blunt (1989) indicated that in 1941 the first comprehensive study on public administration education, *Education for Public Administration*, was published. The author of the study, George Graham, addressed curriculum issues, institutional concerns, and specific training programs. Graham also suggested that universities needed to provide a liberal education at the undergraduate level and comprehensive offerings at the graduate level. Based on the results of his research, Graham found that the fields of study at the graduate level should include courses such as economics, political science and statistics, English, psychology, history, and public speaking. With respect to delivery of course materials and instructional methods, Graham advised that the use of public officials (i.e., practitioners) as lecturers “brings finer details to a course” (p. 622).
During the 1950s, tension between political science and public administration became apparent. The discipline of political science argued for domination over public administration. The field of public administration, in terms of scholarly production and institutional growth and development, fell into a dormant state because of conflicts between political science and public administration over philosophy, identity, and independence. However, there were some distinct developments in the mid-1950s that had significant effects on the growth of public administration education as a professional program. The Committee on Graduate Education for Public Administration was established by the American Society for Public Administration. This committee was comprised of deans of schools of public affairs and administration who were interested in extolling the values and virtues of preparing individuals for public service through public administration (Blunt, 1989).

According to Mosher (1975), the social, political, and economic events of the 1960s and 1970s were recognized by public administration literature as having a significant causal effect on the field of public administration education. The Great Society legislative programs, the civil rights movement, the Vietnam war, and the Watergate scandal contributed to increased interest in analyzing programmatic aspects of public policy and affairs, which in turn caused an upsurge in enrollment, institutional growth and development, and research in the field of public administration.

According to Blunt (1989), it was during the 1980s when new developments, innovations, and standards for U.S. public administration education emerged. In 1981, the first text entitled *Applied Statistics for Public Administration* was published. In 1986 the Council of Post Secondary Accreditation (COPA)--now CHEA--recognized and approved NASPAA as a specialized accrediting agency to accredit master’s degree programs in public administration. Also during that year, an entire issue of the Public Administration Review was exclusively devoted to the subject of information systems in public management, and in 1988 the first book devoted solely to the subject of ethics in public administration was published (p. 621). In 1997 George Fredrickson
(1997), a highly regarded scholar in public administration, wrote that “. . . the spirit of public administration is found in (1) defining our domain broadly; (2) setting our task to be the efficient, economical, and equitable management of public organizations and institutions; (3) limiting the scope of our field to the partisan advocacy of our organizations’ missions; (4) focusing equally on federal, state, and local government; (5) managing public organizations and institutions so as to enhance the prospects for change and responsiveness; (6) serving the citizens fairly and benevolently” (p. 235).

The year 1998 marked 110 years of public administration education being offered by United States colleges and universities. In 1998, the American Society for Public Administration celebrated its 60th year anniversary of service and research. The American Society for Public Administration claimed in its May 2001 issue of PA Times, that it had more than 10,000 members who were teachers, researchers, students, and practitioners of public administration.

**Ideological Constructs**

According to Henry (1975), the intellectual and institutional development of public administration as an academic field may be conceived by a succession of four overlapping paradigms and the addition of a fifth paradigm:

1) Politics and Administration Dichotomy
2) The Principles of Administration and Challenge
3) Public Administration as Political Science
4) Public Administration as Administrative Science
5) Public Administration as Public Administration

The literature is replete with reference to Henry’s Paradigms by other authors in the field of public administration. According to Chandler (1989), “These (Henry’s) paradigms detail the relevant pedagogies via an expansive recapitulation of the development of public administration” (p. 642).

**Paradigm One: The Political/Administration Dichotomy, 1900-1926**

According to Henry (1975), Paradigm One was developed and advanced by early public administration scholars like Frank J. Goodnow and Leonard D. White. These scholars contended that the study of public administration should
concentrate on two distinct formations of government: politics (legislative branch) and administration (executive branch).

Henry (1975) quoted Goodnow who said, "Politics has to do with policies of expressions of state will, while administration has to do with the execution of these policies" (p. 379). White and Goodnow advocated that politics should be separate and not intrude upon the administration of policy programming (p. 379).

**Paradigm Two: The Principles of Administration, 1927-1937**

Henry (1975) stated that in 1927 the second textbook in public administration was published: *Principles of Public Administration*, by F. W. Willoughby. According to Henry, Willoughby said, "... certain scientific principles of administration were there; that they could be discovered, and that administrators would be expert in their work if they learned how to apply these principles" (p. 379). According to Gordon (1978), the functions of public executives, as defined by Gulick and Urwick (1937), were: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting (POSDCORB), which have become known as professional watch words in public administration (p. 24).

According to Henry (1975), the year 1937 was marked by public administration scholars as the time when "the high noon of orthodoxy" in the study of public administration took place, with the publication of Luther H. Gulick’s and Lyndall Urwick’s *Papers on the Science of Administration* (p. 380). According to Henry, Urwick said:

> It is the general thesis of this paper that there are principles which can be arrived at inductively from the study of human organization which should govern arrangements for human association of any kind. The principles can be studied as a technical question, irrespective of the purpose of the enterprise, the personnel comprising it, or any constitutional, political or social theory underlying its creation. (p. 380)

**The Challenge, 1938-1950**

According to Henry (1975), from 1938 to 1950 scholars inside and outside of the field of public administration challenged the politics and administration dichotomy and principles of administration notion of public administration. Henry traced the challenge to the 1940s and attributed it to two public administration
scholars, Fritz Morestein Marx and Herbert Simon. Marx, in 1946, edited a book of readings, titled *Elements of Public Administration*. According to Henry, Marx “questioned the assumption that politics and administration could be dichotomized” (p. 380). Herbert Simon, in his 1947 book, *Administrative Behavior*, raised objections to the principles of administration paradigm. Henry said, “Simon effectively demonstrated that for every ‘principle’ of administration advocated in the literature there was a counter-principle, thus rendering the very idea of principles moot” (p. 380).

Henry (1975) indicated that by mid-century, the politics and administration dichotomy and the principles of administration paradigms were considered to be passe “by creative intellects in the field” (p. 380). Henry stated that this situation “left public administration bereft of a distinct epistemological identity. Some would argue that an identity has yet to be found” (p. 380).

However, according to Henry (1975), Herbert Simon, in 1947, had also reacted to the challenge by offering a new paradigm for public administration in his essay entitled “A Comment on ‘The Science of Public Administration’ that appeared in the Public Administration Review.”

Henry (1975) stated:

Simon’s new paradigm for public administration meant that . . . public administration should be concerned with developing a pure science of administration based on a thorough grounding in 1) social psychology, and 2) a larger group concerned with prescribing public policy. (p. 380)

Henry (1975) acknowledged Simon’s proposal to be “both rigorous and normative in its emphasis” (p. 380) but stated:

Simon’s call for a “pure science” put off many scholars in public administration and political science alike. First, Simon’s urging that social psychology provided the basis for understanding administrative behavior struck many public administrationists as foreign and discomfiting; most of them had no training in social psychology. Second, since science was perceived as “value-free,” it followed that a “science of administration” logically would ban public administrationists from what many of them perceived as their richest sources of inquiry—normative political theory, the concept of the public interest and the entire spectrum of human values. (p. 381)
Henry (1975) said political scientists began to question the field’s action orientation as early as the mid-1930s. Rather than advocating a public service and executive preparatory program as they had in 1914, political scientists began calling for, in the words of Caldwell, an “intellectual understanding” of the executive branch, rather than “knowledgeable action” on the part of public administrators (p. 381).

Paradigm Three: Public Administration as Political Science, 1950-1970

According to Henry (1975), the two decades between 1950 and 1970 provided the field of public administration with its two greatest challenges with respect to its identity and existence as an independent field of study. With regard to public administration’s identity, Henry cited Martin Landau who stated that “writings on public administration in the 1950s spoke of the field as an ‘emphasis,’ an ‘area of interest,’ or even as a synonym of political science” (p. 381).

According to Henry (1975), it was in the 1960s, especially in 1962, 1964 and 1967, that public administration’s identity and independence as a viable academic field of study was threatened. Henry said, “In 1962, public administration was not included as a sub field of political science in the report of the Committee on Political Science as a Discipline of the American Political Science Association” (p. 381). A survey had been conducted in 1964 by political scientists. They concluded that the Public Administration Review was, according to Albert Somit and Joseph Tanenhaus “…slipping in prestige among political scientists relative to other journals, and signaled a decline of faculty interest in public administration generally” (p. 381).

Henry (1975) stated that, “In 1967, public administration disappeared as an organizing category in the program of the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association.” (p. 381). Henry referred to Dwight Waldo, who noted that in 1968, political scientists held an attitude toward public administration that ranged from apathy to disdain.

According to Henry (1975), during the 1950s and 1960s, the study of public administration was still attracting students and governmental grants
despite the recurring conflicts between public administrationists and political scientists. The field of public administration until the 1970s still remained conceptually bound by and found in political science departments (p. 381).

Paradigm Four: Public Administration as Administrative Science, 1956-1970

Henry (1975) stated that during this time, public administration was faced with existence as an academic discipline without an individual identity. According to Henry, this situation was created because of the “undisguised contempt” displayed by a number of political science departments. Some public administrationists began searching for an alternative. The alternative to which they turned was the development in administrative science that was taking place in the nation’s business schools (p. 382).

According to Henry (1975), in 1956 a new journal was founded entitled Administrative Science Quarterly. The premise for the founding of that journal was that “public, business and institutional administration were false distinctions, that administration was administration” (p. 382).

Henry (1975) stated that the focus of public administration during this time was on the differing aspects of administrative science; i.e., organizational development. Henry (1975) stated that “there was a problem in the Administrative Science route, and a real one” (p. 382).

Henry (1975) stated that if public administration’s sole focus was to be administrative science, “could one continue to speak of public administration? . . . After all, administrative science, while not advocating universal principles, nevertheless did and does contend that all organizations and managerial methodologies have certain characteristics, patterns, and pathologies in common” (p. 382).

According to Henry (1975), the public and private domains of America’s community had become a focal point in determining where the conceptual basis of public administration should be grounded. Henry said:

Part of this concept dilemma . . . lay in the traditional distinction between public and private sphere of American society. What is public administration, what is everything else (i.e., ‘private’ administration), what is the dividing line between the two types has been a painful dilemma for a
number of years.” (p. 382).

This dilemma is not yet fully resolved and confusion about the public variety of the field of administration seems at least understandable; one scholar [Caldwell], in fact, has argued that we should begin talking about ‘public administration’ since all kinds of managerial organizations increasingly find themselves relating to public, governmental, and political concerns due to the growing interrelatedness of technological societies. (p. 382).

Paradigm Five: Public Administration as Public Administration, 1970-?

According to Henry (1975), the activities of public affairs were the locus or base of public administration both conceptually and institutionally. “Public administrationists have been increasingly concerned with the inextricably related areas of policy science, political economy, the public policymaking process and its analysis, and the measurement of policy outputs” (p. 383).

Henry (1975) believed that scholars in the field of public administration also did not view the activities of the “public sphere” and “private sphere” as separate from each other because of those already mentioned inextricably related areas. Therefore, according to Henry, those interlocking relationships between the private sector and public sector “can be viewed in some ways, as a linkage between public administration’s evolving focus and locus” (p. 383).

Henry (1975) said that “A major sign of public administration’s growing independence is the dramatic growth of institutes of government, public administration and urban affairs, and various kinds of public policy centers in universities” (p. 384). Henry concluded his essay with the following resolve: “For perhaps the first time in public administration’s 80 years in quandary, a tentative paradigm has been formulated for the field that defines the discipline’s ‘specialized what’ and its ‘institutional where’” (p. 384). Nevertheless, as the study and practice of public administration in the United States enters its second century of existence, the question of whether American public administration education is a field of study with or without a focus has resurfaced and is being re-examined by scholars of public administration.
Ventriss, in 1991, posed a familiar question, “What should be the focus of American public administration education”? (p. 4) According to Ventriss (1991) the answer to that question is shaped by the way public administrationists address the myriad “inexorably linked” issues that are still vexing public administration education (p. 5).

Ventriss (1991) identified these issues as: “What is the meaning of public administration?” “How has the schism between theory and practice of public administration caused an educational disjunction?”, and “What is the role and relevance of public administration?” Ventriss identified factors that were critical in developing a focus for American public administration education. They were:

1. The imperfect communication between scholars of public affairs and practitioners;
2. The pedagogical ambivalence of what role the field should play in shaping societal affairs;
3. The inherent tension of an interdisciplinary approach to public affairs that runs the risk of fragmenting the field;
4. The present fixation of an education inclination focused almost exclusively on domestic affairs in an era of the internationalization of public issues; and
5. The uneasy relationship among analytical, management and policy knowledge and how varied understanding can be conceptually integrated. (p. 5).

Ventriss provided no answers. However, he did provide basic understandings and ideas based on discussion and interpretation of previous studies that were relevant to the issues and factors presented. Some of the ideas that Ventriss presented are:

1. Initiation of a mutual learning research approach to help bridge the dichotomy between theory and practice;
2. Broadening of the field’s intellectual net to educate prospective public leaders outside of administration who need to become acquainted with the complex intricacies of policy issues, especially given that most policy issues exist in an interconnected political and economic environment;
3. Reexamination of an interdisciplinary faculty who, because many have little conceptual understanding of public administration, strip the field of a shared culture or ethic;
4. A call for internationalizing public administration and public policy; and finally,
5. A reevaluation of the growing separation of public policy from management that has led to a form of educational Taylorism. Part of the balance which links analysis, management, and policy will mean nothing less than the rediscovery of the public. (p. 12).
Study and Practice

Goals and Objectives

The study and practice of public administration education have taken place for more than 100 years in the U.S., both in higher education and in government at the federal, state, and local levels. According to Short (1958), the goal and objective of most higher education institutions in the U.S. that offer courses, degrees, and instruction in public administration was to prepare the administrative generalist and specialist at the undergraduate and graduate levels to find employment in federal, state, or local government, i.e., city management or personnel management.

Program Support Factors

In 1975, Stone and Stone offered an analysis of what affects or hinders the capability or performance of a school or program in public administration. Stone and Stone (1975) said “the capability or performance of a school or program of Public Affairs/Public Administration is reflected by the ratio between two rough aggregates that can be explained by an algebraic formula” (p. 39).

According to Stone and Stone (1975) the two aggregates were described and explained by the following elements. First, an effective mix of:

IL: Institutional Legitimiziation

PM: Political Mandate; i.e., support of purposes and programs by university authorities

EL: Executive Leadership by dean or director and program heads

FIA: Facilitative Internal Administration: organization, systems, and processes

R: Resources: human, physical, informational, monetary.

Second, a limited number of obstacles:

S: Saboteurs from political science, business administration, or other units that historically have opposed establishment of strong programs in this field
LS: Lack of Support by local, state, and federal agencies for the educational and research product of the school

CO: Extent of reliance of university on College Organs for administrative and budgetary decisions

ED: External Disasters such as economic depression, wars, and changes in government that erode responsibility for supporting education and research (e.g., Title IX, HUD fellowships, EPA training grants)

ID: Internal Disasters such as scandal in the library, heart failure of a successful dean, domination by disciplinary or analytically preoccupied faculty.

According to Stone and Stone (1975) the capability—even the survival potential—of any institution can be calculated by use of the following algebraic formula:

\[
\text{Capability} = \frac{(IL + PM)(EL + FIA) \times R}{(S + LS) \times CO \times (ED + ID)}
\]

The authors noted that:

By applying a scale (e.g., 1 to 10) to each element, a rating for a school can be made. Too many years have elapsed to make informed appraisals of programs covered by our case histories. Nevertheless, some of their comparative strengths and weaknesses are made readily discernible by this assessment process. Obviously, it is the... process, not the numerical result, that has value. (pp. 39-40).

In summary, Short’s (1958) and Stone and Stone’s (1975) studies maintained that certain external and internal influences and factors such as special and sufficient financing and political, community, and institutional supports and leadership must be effectuated, combined, and harmonized in order to begin, provide, or sustain a successful program or school in public affairs and public administration.

According to Fredrickson (1975):

The United States economy has moved relentlessly from a production of goods to a provision of services orientation which has caused growth in public service employment opportunities. The general growth in
government programs has, in turn, caused growth in public administration employment. However, when the rate of government growth has slowed or stabilized, public administration employment has reacted similarly. (pp. 9-10).

Traditionally, the principles, applications, and skills of public administration education have been utilized primarily for budget, personnel, and planning functions of United States government. In essence, the practice of public administration today is not limited exclusively to the three levels of United States government. Public administration is now being conducted by a complex combination of private and public sector institutions such as banks, hospitals, industrial corporations, nonprofit corporations, states, counties, cities, and others that have assumed public responsibilities in the form of service delivery by performing program operations as nonfederal third parties that follow priorities and receive funding from the national government (Musolf & Seidman, 1980, (pp. 124-130).

Public administration education is being practiced at the international, national, state and regional, and urban and local levels of government. As a public function for the public sector, public administration education is found in community development, educational administration, finance and budgeting, international development administration, national security and arms control, public health, and personnel, to name a few (Poore, 1982).

Academic and Organizational Responsibility

The responsibility for the study of public administration at the graduate and undergraduate level of programming in terms of its inputs, processes, and outputs has been located in colleges of arts and sciences or schools of social sciences’ departments of political science in colleges and universities in the United States (NASPAA, 1996). Research indicated that there had been a recent shift in the location of the academic and organizational responsibility for training in public administration at the graduate and undergraduate degree program levels.
Graduate Level (i.e., Doctoral, Masters)

The recent shift, according to the 1996 NASPAA survey report of programs in public administration, placed the location of academic and organizational responsibility for graduate training programs in separate professional schools, separate departments, and professional schools combined with other professional schools; e.g., Florida State University’s Reubin O’D. Askew School of Public Administration and Policy and Cornell University’s School of Business and Public Administration.

Undergraduate Level (i.e., Bachelors, Associate)

According to a review of the 1996 NASPAA survey report and Swain’s 1985 study on undergraduate public administration programming at the bachelors degree level, it seems that the academic and organizational responsibility for public administration programming at the bachelors degree level is also located in a variety of contexts in colleges and universities in the United States, such as colleges of arts and sciences, divisions of social science, public policy departments, and public affairs departments. At this time there is not enough research data available to locate the academic and organizational responsibility for public administration programming at the associate degree level.

Curriculum

Curriculum is defined as a set of courses that are offered in a particular subject as a program of study. In 1941, Graham, a widely-recognized scholar in public service education, completed his Education for Public Administration study. He sent out a survey to people in public service, asking them to suggest courses they believed should be required for public service education. According to Graham (1941), the courses “they recommended were public administration, economics, statistics, political science, public finance and fiscal administration, personnel administration, constitutional and administrative law, accounting, English, and psychology” (p. 323).
According to Blair, Martin, and Sayre (1958), in 1947 Fesler proposed a hard core of seven subjects in undergraduate training in public administration: political science, economics, American history, public administration, statistics, English composition, and psychology. Fesler also believed that the following had value as required courses: sociology, anthropology, public speaking, public policy, political parties, and public opinion. Jump (1947) said an acceptable end-product of public programs “was the man who could grasp the economic, social, political, and other broad implications of public programs” (p. 212), along with this person being prepared “to master some of the precise details of the administration” (p. 212).

A consensus was reached by a group of well-known public administration scholars and educators in 1958 as to which courses should constitute the core curriculum in undergraduate education in public administration. Blair, Martin, and Sayre (1958) said that “the core of seven areas include political science, economics, public administration, American history, statistics, English composition, and accounting” (p. 59).

Swain, in 1985, sent out surveys to 71 undergraduate public administration programs listed in the 1983-1984 NASPAA Directory in order to provide comparative standards of practice against which to assess the undergraduate public administration program of Edward Waters College in Jacksonville, Florida. Forty-three completed survey forms were returned for a 60% response rate. The general results of Swain’s survey research study provided information about the design and implementation of baccalaureate degree programs in public administration. Swain (1985) said that “A basic finding of this research, and not a newly discovered one, is that a great deal of variety exists among undergraduate public administration programs but that variety exists within an identifiable common foundation of similar program elements” (p. 311).

Swain (1985) also said that “another indicator of diversity within commonality is types of degrees awarded” (p. 311). According to Swain (1985), the most common degree offered by survey respondents
is a bachelor of science in public administration, followed by bachelor of arts in public administration, and a bachelor of arts or bachelor of science in political science with a concentration in public administration. A number of schools reported offering undergraduate degrees in business and public administration, public affairs, public policy, and management.” (p. 311).

According to Swain (1985), there were examples of how variety and commonality existed in undergraduate programming in public administration, i.e., where programs were housed (p. 311). Swain reported that the majority (45%) of the respondents indicated that these programs operated out of political science departments. Swain’s findings also indicated that many of the other respondents reported that their programs were “housed in departments, divisions, schools and colleges” (p. 311). Swain’s specific findings also related to the design of course offerings among undergraduate degree programs in public administration. The results of his research showed that there were varying types of courses offered; however, there was a certain core subject matter that dominated the curricula of baccalaureate degree programs in public administration (p. 316). According to Swain, the courses that were reported as constituting the certain core subject matter were: introduction to public administration, organization and management and organizational behavior, governmental and public finance and budgeting, and American government (p. 315). Swain’s findings also showed that 28 of 43 institutions that responded required statistics as a required core course in their public administration curriculum.

Swain (1985) further reported that internship or practicum experience was, indeed, offered and or required as a part of the curricula of baccalaureate degree programs in public administration in most institutions. Respondents from 38 of 43 institutions who returned completed surveys, indicated that they offered an internship and or practicum experience in their programs. Only 15 of those 38 actually required all of their students to take the internship and practicum experience as part of their degree programs.

The National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration had developed and adopted curriculum guidelines and standards for community and junior college transfer programs and for bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral
degree programs in public affairs and administration. According to NASPAA, “The guidelines and standards are not prescriptive in nature. They are intended to provide guidance to faculty who are developing and/or evaluating academic degree programs in public affairs and administration” (NASPAA, 1976, p. ii).

Degrees Offered

Colleges and universities in the United States confer certificates and associate, bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral degrees in the academic discipline of public affairs and public administration (The College Blue Book, 1999). A brief description of those certificates and degrees follows.

Certificates are awarded by two-year colleges for a range of offerings with special purposes. They may be awarded for completion of vocational training requirements linked closely with apprenticeship training, or with the training needs of governmental and social service agencies. Certificate programs often involve concentration in one field of study with no additional general education or distribution requirements. Some may be of short duration, lasting from 9 to 20 weeks (Blackburn, 1979).

The Associate of Arts degree (A.A.) is awarded primarily by U.S. junior and community colleges after satisfactorily completing two years of study. The degree is designed as a transfer degree, which includes courses that parallel the offerings of four-year institutions (The College Board).

The Associate of Science (A.S.) degree is granted after completing a program of study similar to the first two years of a four-year college curriculum. The Associate in Applied Science (A.A.S.) is awarded by many colleges on completion of technological or vocational programs of study (The College Board, 2005).

The Bachelor of Arts (B.A.), Bachelor of Science (B.S.), and Bachelor of Public Administration (B.P.A.) degrees are awarded to students who satisfactorily complete four-year or two-year community or junior college transfer programs of studies. The degrees are used either as entry-level credentials for public service delivery employment or as prerequisites for graduate study (Swain, 1985).
The Master of Public Administration (M.P.A.), Master of Arts in Public Administration (M.A.P.A.), Master of Science in Public Administration (M.S.P.A.), Master of Government Administration (M.G.A.), Master of Public Policy (M.P.P.), and Master of Public Affairs (M.P.A.) degrees are awarded to those students who satisfactorily complete 18-month to two-year programs of studies beyond the bachelor’s level. According to NASPAA, the M.P.A. degree is a professional degree designed to serve as the credential for entry-level management positions in governmental service and related fields (NASPAA, n.d.).

The Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) or the Doctor of Public Administration (D.P.A.) degree is awarded to the student who satisfactorily completes a particular program of study. The student must conduct, complete, and satisfactorily defend a significant research study in the form of a dissertation (NASPAA n.d.).

Summary

According to the literature reviewed for this study, it was not until the late 1800s and early 1900s that the study of public administration began to appear in the colleges and universities of the United States. The focus and mission of early public administration education was to professionalize the government by separating politics from administration. In response to the citizen and civic reform groups, private and public universities began to conduct classes in public administration and to conduct and publish research on the study and practice of public administration in America. The literature reviewed is in agreement that the first conceptual and theoretical basis that early scholars (1900-1920s) in public administration drew upon was that politics should be separate from, and not intrude upon, the administration of public policy programming.

By the 1930s a great amount of growth and development was taking place in the field of public administration in America. There was an increase in the number of colleges and universities offering degree programs in public administration. Also, many state governments had begun to establish and support public administration research bureaus at their state university campuses. During this time, the focus of public administration began to shift
from the political and administration dichotomy to principles of administration.

According to Henry (1975), Gulick and Urwick in 1937 said “there are principles which can be arrived at inductively from the study of human organization . . .” (p. 380). Since the publication of *The Science of Administration* in 1937, the principles of administration (POSCORB: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting) have been and continue to be a subject of scholarly debate and review.

According to Blunt (1989) and Henry (1975), it was in the 1940s that certain criticism came from the mainstream of public administration scholars such as Fritz Morestein Marx and Herbert Simon. Writing in 1947, Marx and Simon challenged the two major theoretical concepts of public administration: (1) the political-administration dichotomy, and (2) principles of administration. These creative scholars of public administration contended that the activities of politics and administration are inseparable and that principles of administration are inconsistent because principles tend to be value laden and therefore logically inconsistent (Blunt, 1989; Henry, 1975).

According to Henry (1975), the two traditional conceptual and theoretical aspects of public administration were intellectually challenged, discounted, and abandoned by some creative scholars of the field at that time. Those scholars offered the field of public administration a new focus. Herbert Simon, in particular, is credited with providing a new paradigm for public administration. Simon opined that “public administration should concern itself and place an emphasis on developing a pure science of administration (administrative science) that would be based on an understanding of social psychology and public policy prescription” (p. 380). Henry stated that this new perspective of administrative science offered by Simon struck many academic scholars in political science and public administration as too “technically oriented” and “too rigorous” (pp. 380-381).

According to Carter and Brinlee (1982), political scientists, such as Waldo, resisted and refused to recognize the merits of Simon’s proposals. Waldo argued that the “fact-value dichotomy was inapplicable in public administration
theory . . . because Simon’s approach denied normative considerations” (p. 116). Instead, Waldo and others relied on old concepts and theories that centered on the intellectualized understanding of the executive branch of the United States government (Carter & Brinlee, 1982).

Academic political science scholars also obstructed the drive by public administration to become an independent field of study. From the 1950s to the present, public administration’s locus and focus, its identity and existence have been subject to continual scholarly debate without resolution. Moreover, the field of public administration has been beset with the challenge of establishing an identity independent from political science (Carter & Brinlee, 1982).

According to Henry (1975), from the 1950s through the 1960s, the field of public administration was dominated by the academic field of political science. By 1967, the field of public administration was no longer listed as a category in the program of the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association and there was little interest in conducting research in the field of public administration. However, during this same time period (1956-1970), there were scholars in public administration and in other fields such as business administration who advocated study in the area of administrative science with emphasis in areas of management, organizational design, and behavior (Henry, 1975). The field’s resurgence in terms of scholarly activities and the rise in student enrollment has been attributed to political, social, and economic events of the 1960s and early 1970s. This new interest in domestic and international public affairs issues such as urban renewal, the Vietnam war, and the Watergate scandal spurred scholarly interest and research by academic public administrators that focused on the nature of public and private organizational roles in developing and implementing public policy (Blunt, 1989; Mosher, 1975).

Traditionally, the locus and focus of public administration study had been influenced by political science departments. Their studies centered only on the theoretical, intellectual understanding of legitimate governmental institutional arrangements. Other public administrationists who were associated with political science departments and other departments such as business administration
began to shift their focus toward the public interest and public affairs. Instead of analyzing distinct institutional arrangements of governmental organizations, they concentrated on issues that relate to policy. According to literature reviewed, this new definitional basis for the determination and implementation of public policy caused the discipline of public administration to be reconsidered as an independent, institutionally separate academic field of study.

In 1970, NASPAA was established in Washington, D.C. The purpose of NASPAA is to serve as “a national center for information about programs and developments in public affairs and administration” (NASPAA, n.d.).

From 1973 to the present, it became evident that public administration has become a separate professional field of study in higher education in the United States. In 1986, the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) recognized and approved NASPAA as a specialized accrediting agency to accredit master’s degrees in public administration. However, at the end of the first century and as the second century of the study and practice of public administration in the United States begins, it appears that public administration as a degree-granting field of study in institutions of higher education is at a crossroads because of certain issues which have influenced and continue to influence public administration education in higher education.

Foremost Issues of the Field

The following discussion will identify and explain, based on the literature reviewed, the three foremost issues affecting the study and practice of public administration education in the United States today as well as other general issues that have influenced and are still influencing the field. This discussion will also focus on what is known with certainty, the controversies, the future trends, and the unanswered questions that are associated with the issues to be presented.

*Issue I: An Accredited Field of Study?*

The issue of whether public administration is considered an accredited field of study in higher education in the United States has been a recent subject of scholarly inquiry because of the following circumstances. In 1970, NASPAA
was established by the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) and charged with the responsibility of serving as a national center for information about programs and developments in public affairs and administration education for colleges and universities in the United States.

According to Poore (1982), it was only four years later, in 1974, that NASPAA members took their first step toward providing a better definition of the field of public administration by adopting a set of guidelines and standards. These guidelines were designed to encourage the development of a professional focus in master’s degree programs, in contrast to a liberal arts focus; to include a mastery of professional competencies in the curricula; and to feature the attributes of public service management as distinguished from private business management. Poore said, “The decision made by NASPAA member programs placed the association in a leadership position” (p. 86).

In 1977, NASPAA approved a set of standards for master’s degree programs that was entitled Standards for Professional Master’s Degree Programs in Public Administration/Public Affairs. According to those standards, the process was to be “voluntary and to ensure that minimal education standards exist for degree programs within the discipline” (NASPAA, 1977). Poore (1982) said that:

“if the NASPAA efforts proved successful, then the standards should have the following impacts upon the field of public administration: (a) Broad acceptance of public administration as a field of multi disciplinary professional education; (b) Recognition that with good program design a very broad array of public functions or specialties under the public administration umbrella can be strength; (c) Eventual acceptance of a set of general knowledge, abilities, and skills as a common base for all programs; and (d) Program designs providing means-to-end linkages between common core components and advanced work.” (pp. 85-86).

According to Blunt (1989), the NASPAA membership voted 61 to 29 in 1983 to apply for recognition by the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA). In 1986, COPA approved NASPAA as an accreditation organization for master’s level educational programs in public administration. However,
NASPAA’s role as an accrediting organization has been subject to scholarly inquiry as to what effects accreditation has had on the programs, the program directors, and their relationship with NASPAA’s role as an accrediting organization. The 1987 study by Daniels and Johansen suggested that even though more program directors approved than disapproved of NASPAA becoming an accreditation agency, accreditation appeared to be an unsettled issue among program directors because a sizeable number of program directors disapproved of such an accreditation process. The authors did not provide specific findings as to why the program directors disapproved of such a process.

According to Daniels and Johansen, the disapproving directors who opposed accreditation were those whose programs were “in a struggle for identity... new or relatively small programs, and probably feel that NASPAA accreditation would be just one more hurdle to jump in order to have an established program” (p. 84).

Daniels and Johansen (1987) said, “It is difficult to predict how accreditation granting status will affect the relationship of NASPAA to schools and programs” (p. 84). The authors stated that “the peer review process would improve public service education” (p. 84). Daniels and Johansen recommended that further research be conducted on the attitudes and perceptions of MPA students, faculty members, and practitioners toward NASPAA accreditation, and they concluded that findings from this type of research, if different from the perspectives of the program directors, may provide greater insight into ways to bolster professionalism in the public service.

According to National Association of Schools for Public Affairs (2002), accreditation is a voluntary measure for master’s degree programs. There are 250 U.S. colleges and universities that offer master’s degrees in public administration, affairs and public policy who are NASPAA members. There are 135 of 250 master’s programs (54%) that are accredited by NASPAA. There are unanswered questions as to what role and impact accreditation will have on associate, baccalaureate, and doctoral degree public administration programs in colleges and universities in the United States.
Issue II: A Profession?

The issue of whether public administration is a profession has been the subject of continual debate since the early 1920s when graduate programs in public administration were established. Pugh (1989) reexamined the question of whether public administration is a profession by addressing the issue from an historical basis. He then provided referenced and evaluative commentary about the subject. The author also offered a case for and a case against a profession of public administration and examined the role of the American Society for Public Administration and the relevance of this issue to academicians and practitioners alike.

According to Pugh (1989), organizations like the International City Management Association (ICMA) and the Municipal Finance Officers of America (MFOA) worked hard in the 1920s to advocate that the status of public administration be considered a profession. These organizations, along with other public and private foundations and philanthropic groups, gave technical assistance and financial support to academicians and practitioners for research and training programs in public administration.

The American Society for Public Administration was organized in 1939, and in the same year Public Administration Review, the first periodical devoted to the subject of public administration, was published (Pugh, 1989). The purpose for the establishment of the American Society for Public Administration and the publication of Public Administration Review was to provide academicians and practitioners with an official representative body and forum to explore and evaluate practices and principles of public administration (pp. 1-3).

Pugh (1989) made his case for public administration as a profession by using the preceding historical basis of trends and events. He continued to establish the case for public administration as a profession by offering a definition of a profession and six indicators of what constitute a profession. According to Pugh, a profession is “a calling requiring specialized knowledge and often long and intensive academic preparation; a principal calling, vocation, or employment (and) the whole body of persons engaged in a calling” (pp. 1-3). Pugh’s six
attributes that connote a profession are: “(1) a cast of mind (i.e., a self
awareness); (2) a corpus of theory and knowledge; (3) social ideal; (4) ethical
standards; (5) formal organization to promote its interests; and (6) a ‘hall of fame’
to recognize outstanding leaders” (p. 1).

Pugh (1989) said “the case against public administration as a profession
began as early as 1939 when Brownlow objected, without explanation, to
Mosher’s efforts to recognize public administration as a profession by formulating
plans to organize the American Society for Public Administration” (p. 4).
According to Pugh, Welborn in 1954 wrote an article in the *Public Administration
Review* where he openly objected to the idea that public administration is a
profession on two grounds: “One, public administration has failed to achieve a
common criteria associated with a profession; two, the very nature of the public
service in a constitutional democracy was incompatible with characteristics of a
profession...and the self-interested behavior of professionals...” (p. 4).

According to Pugh (1989), Bowman rejected the idea of public
administration being a profession. Bowman contended that “The notion of public
administration being a profession is flawed because the field fails to satisfy
criteria normally associated with a profession” (p. 4).

From Bowman’s critique and a review of publications by others who
opposed the concept of public administration as a profession, Pugh (1989) stated
that there were three separate grounds (normative inconsistency, empirical
refutation, and political incongruity) for such opposition.

The grounds of normative inconsistency means that there is a lack of a
clear disciplinary base in the field. It is also addresses the fear of some that
professional administration is incompatible with a constitutional democracy. The
assumption that professions always act out of self-interest is included in these
grounds, as is the belief that professionalism leads to a kind of guild-feudal
system.

The second ground, empirical reputation, exists if public administration
lacks the basic attributes that characterize a profession. Those who oppose the
profession say public administration fails to live up to the sociological model of a
profession. Some suggest administration, itself, is a subject that defies the level of theory building and development of a corpus of knowledge that is necessary to sustain a profession. Scholars both in and outside of the field have seriously questioned the theories, facts, and principles that constitute the corpus of knowledge in public administration, lending support to the grounds of empirical refutation.

The final grounds of political incongruity exist when a professional public service, given current governmental institutions, is not politically feasible for at least two reasons. The first reason suggests the accoutrements of power over decisions and the autonomy of control over direction associated with professions in general seem beyond the grasp of public administrators. Public administrators must remain responsive to elected officials who have the legitimate authority to establish policy and demand accountability. The second reason, patronage, is the elected official's ways and means to retain control over the career service. Patronage occurs when staffing of high-level senior positions in governmental bureaucracies is based on partisanship rather than merit. The critics say this practice would not be acceptable in any legitimate profession (pp. 4-6).

According to Pugh (1989), the case opposing public administration as a profession appeared to be compelling because of the disputation raised in the normative, empirical political arguments presented. Nevertheless, ASPA through its association with NASPAA and NAPA has maintained behaviors and accoutrements that are generally associated with professions. For example, there has been an increase in the number of university training programs, the establishment of an accreditation agency, the expansion of specialized occupational associations, the creation of professional honors and awards, and the development of professional standards and ethics.

Pugh (1989) however, described the current status of the professional issue in public administration as paradoxical in nature. This paradox, according to Pugh, stemmed from those in the field who are content with behaving as if public administration is a profession while failing to resolve the issue of whether or not the goal of public administration as a profession is obtainable or wanted.
This was suggested by Pugh’s analysis of the Stahl and McGuinn (1986) article. Pugh said that by “Professionalizing the career service, that the field runs the risk of expending resources such as time and energy on an objective that may be unattainable at best or dysfunctional at worst” (p. 8).

According to Pugh (1989), it will be ASPA’s responsibility to foster and advance the notion of professionalism in public administration. The issue of whether the study and practice of public administration is considered to be a profession is unresolved because of opposing attitudinal, definitional, and perceptual differences held by scholars and practitioners in the United States in the field of public administration.

*Issue III: Theory and Practice: An Indefinite Dichotomy?*

Ventriss (1991) claimed that “an educational disjunction” has occurred due to the schism between the theory and practice of public administration. According to Ventriss (1991), “The schism between theory and practice is not new” (p. 5), and it may be attributed to “(1) imperfect communication between academicians and practitioners of public administration; (2) non- or misapplication of theory to practice, and/or (3) a difference in reward systems for academicians and practitioners” (p. 5).

Ventriss (1991) said that a dichotomy exists between theory and practice because “scholar and practitioner have increasingly learned to talk past one another” (p. 6). According to Stone and Stone (1975), academicians tend to be preoccupied with “theory, abstractions, and research methodology” where practitioners are more likely to be “concerned with applications, operations, and performance” (p. 26).

According to Ventriss (1991), there have been attempts to resolve the theory and practice dichotomy issue by those “. . . who advocate such approaches as action theory, phenomenology, and other hybrids . . .” (p. 6); one can assume from Ventriss’ claim that he was referring to academicians. Ventriss said that:

these approaches (as important as they are) miss a crucial point: they veer the field too far to one side in the virulent, albeit legitimate, attack against the invasion of behavioral methodology, at the cost of only landing
the field in a theoretical pit of unbridled subjectivity. The same can be argued for those who fallaciously equate theory with method, as if this ‘puritanism of knowledge’ represents a way to advance the art and science of public administration (it does not). (p. 6)

Ventriss stated that “NASPAA requirements provide public affairs education with little help and guidance on this matter” (p. 6), and asserted that “What is desperately needed is nothing less than a reconceptualization of what constitutes ‘knowledge action’ and the theoretical understanding of public issues” (p. 6).

In closing his discussion about the theory and practice issue, Ventriss (1991) said that he was for possibly eliminating “The gulf between theory and practice . . . by establishing a collaborative research agenda among scholars and practitioners” (p. 6). Ventriss (1991) claimed that “. . . lip service has been given to this idea, but it has not yet taken root” (p. 6), and he suggested that a “collaborative research agenda . . . might provide the kind of communication that will enrich the linkage between university and public institutions” (p. 6). Ventriss recognized those critics who charge that “the linkage could possibly contaminate . . . the scholars’ willingness to explore certain theoretical issues that the practitioners may find unfeasible or even threatening” (p. 6), and countered such critics by stating that “To avoid this fate, the emphasis must be on mutual learning that jointly links scholars and practitioners in furthering their knowledge and maturity on public issues, and not a one-way relationship whereby the research agenda is dictated by the practitioner” (p. 6).

According to Ventriss (1991), “Part of the responsibility of academicians is to raise issues and concerns that may be uncomfortable or even unpopular” (p. 6). Ventriss stated that, “The schism between theory and practice . . . is . . . to a large extent . . . the result of different reward systems of academicians and the practitioners” (p. 5). Ventriss offered John Dyckman’s explanation of the differences in the reward systems of academicians and practitioners. According to Ventriss, Dyckman said:

. . . individual members of the university who must conserve their position(s) in the university and try to rise in that system. They cannot do
so unless they meet the expectations of the university community for publication, and this means the construction of generalizations and ultimately of theoretical systems of explanation....The canons of academic judgment pursue the individual and determine his success. (p. 5)

Ventriss again referred to Dyckman who said, “The [practitioner] may be judged by his fellow professional(s), or by the community which the practitioner serves, but the criteria will be very different from those of the academic community” (p. 5). According to Ventriss, Dyckman stated that:

Fellow professionals may judge him for the size of the budget or quality of staff he has been able to create from the political system, or for the scale of the undertaking he is able to generate or the innovative methods of analysis and programming he mounts. The community may judge him for his political shifts, for his ability to articulate his programs, for his skill in compromising interests or for his ability to inspire visions of the future. (p. 5)

Other Issues

There is still no consensus among public administration scholars as to whether a resolution has been reached regarding what constitutes public administration’s definitional basis and “corpus of knowledge.” Waldo (1980) prepared a list of 14 problems that the field of public administration faced as the 20th century closed. These problems included (a) decreasing growth and increasing scarcity; (b) economy, effectiveness, and efficiency under new and difficult circumstances; (c) trade-offs between hard and soft values; (d) proper amount and mix of professionalism and expertise; (e) unionism in the public sector; (f) values and mechanisms of centralization and decentralization; (g) racial-ethnic and sexual equality; (h) obsolescence of knowledge in public administration; (i) policy making in and by the bureaucracy; (j) needs of the present and proximate future as against the needs of a more distant future; (k) staffing, managing, and controlling new forms of organization; (l) developing less authoritarian, less bureaucratic organizations without at the same time permitting undesirable confusion; (m) increasing ethical complexity and confusion; and (n)
conflict and crisis (pp. 173-186).

Since 1980, when Waldo published that formidable list of problems facing public administration, there has been an increase in scholarly activities and publications by public administration educators focused on one or more of those mentioned problems. A review of publications such as the *Public Administration Review*, and the *Public Administration Quarterly* had not provided any definitive solutions or resolutions to the problems and issues, but rather some focal points of study.

Based on recent review of public administration literature, the issues of whether public policy program development, implementation, and administration practices of the government of the United States at the federal, state, and local levels are or have been executed legally, ethically, economically, effectively, and efficiently appear to be reemerging as subjects for study and research by periodicals in public administration, i.e. *Public Administration Review*. This is due to media disclosures made in the 1980s and 1990s of poor results by governmental programming in the U.S.; e.g., the budget deficit crisis, the savings and loan banking debacle, the Iran-Contra scandal, and lapses in U. S. intelligence and technology relating to China secret arms deals.

With respect to the past, present, and future of public administration education in the United States, the following two issues come to mind with regard to this study that certainly should be addressed by scholars and practitioners inside and outside the field of public administration:

1. Whether the study and practice of public administration education have caused the United States government at the federal, state, and local levels to become more accountable and responsible in its operations.
2. Whether objective, value-free, prescriptive public policy administration directions and solutions offered by scholars and practitioners of public administration can be accepted without being discounted because of partisan politics by federal, state, and local political leaders of a constitutional democracy.

Based upon the literature reviewed for this study, it appears that (a) public
administration education in the United States is the study of people, politics, policies, processes, and programs of public sector organizations; (b) the gulf between theory and practice of public administration could be decreased if scholars and practitioners were to collaborate and communicate; and (c) the past and present purposes of American public administration education have been to educate individuals for careers in public sector organizations; i.e., federal, state, and local governmental agencies.

For over twenty years, there have been a number of empirical studies about various aspects of U.S. public administration education at the doctoral, masters, and bachelor degree levels. Some of those studies examined the type of degrees offered, types of students enrolled in public administration degree programs, curriculum offerings, and what impacts accreditation and distance learning have had upon master’s degree programs in public administration (Brower and Klay, 2000; Poore, 1982). In 1998, Bana and Emory published the first article about associate degree programming in public administration. A review of their article appears in the preceding pages. In summary, the article is a descriptive restatement of information from referenced sources about the who, what, and where associate degree programming in public administration is being offered in U.S. community and junior colleges. It is not a survey research study.

The literature reviewed for this study yielded no empirical data as to the purposes and research questions posed for this study. The purposes of this study are:

1. To provide new empirical data about certain aspects of associate degree programs in public administration that are offered by U.S. community and junior colleges.
2. To determine the emphasis of associate degree programming in public administration, and how the associate degree in public administration is being utilized.
3. Determine what changes are taking place in associate degree programs in public administration that are offered by U.S. public community and junior colleges.
U.S. Public Community Colleges and Junior Colleges

This study’s setting is in U.S. public community colleges and junior colleges. This review of the history, students, mission, functions, curriculum and issues associated with America’s public community colleges and junior colleges provides a background for the study.

History

According to Tillery and Associates (1988) the American community and junior college movement began in the early 1900s. William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago recognized as being the Father of the American Junior College Movement, promoted the idea of awarding the associate degree to students that satisfactorily completed the first two years of junior college work.

Currently, U.S. public community colleges and junior colleges award the Associate of Arts (A.A.), Associate of Science (A.S.) and Associate of Applied Science (A.A.S.) degrees. According to the College Board (2005), the A.A. degree usually takes two years to complete and is designed for transfer purposes into four-year bachelor degree programs at most colleges. The A.S. and A.A.S. degrees are offered in community colleges and technical schools. Those degrees are designed as occupational degrees for technical or vocational fields.

Deegan and Tillery (1988) describe and explain the history of U.S. Public Colleges and Junior Colleges as progressing through and being affected by four distinct generational periods. The four generations are identified as follows: 1) 1900-1930, extension of high school; 2) 1930-1950, the junior college; 3) 1950-1970, the community college; and 4) 1970-mid 1980s, comprehensive community colleges. The authors provide a comprehensive historical discussion of U.S. public community colleges and junior colleges across the four generations from the following perspectives: organization (governance), purpose (mission), programs (curriculum), students (support services) and relations with others (government) (pp. 26-28). Since Deegan, Tilley and Associates wrote Renewing the American Community College in 1985, a fifth generation has emerged. The authors identify this time period as the mid-1980s and label this generational period as being regional development and adult learning.
According to NASPAA and the literature reviewed for this study, U.S. Public Community Colleges and Junior Colleges, since 1972, have been offering associate degrees and certificates in public administration. NASPAA in 1979, developed guidelines for community colleges and junior colleges especially for students who intended to transfer to four year colleges or universities. The offering of public administration education in U.S. public community colleges and junior colleges also coincided with the trends and events that had shaped the fourth generation in those colleges.

Deegan, Tillery and Associates (1988) described the fourth generation (1970s – mid 1980s) as the time period when community colleges and junior colleges expanded their markets. The community colleges and junior colleges courses and degree offerings were dominated by transfer programs and occupational programs. Those programs were designed for an ever-growing diverse group of students who were enrolling into U.S. public community colleges and junior colleges. For example, America’s public community colleges and junior colleges were developing mission statements, programs and services with the goal of providing “something for all” (Deegan, p. 27).

Students

The authors identified these new diverse type of students as being mature adults, re-entry women, underrepresented, career renewers, reverse transfers, on job trainees and joint high school enrollees. In essence, students of the fourth generation “represented a wide range of backgrounds, academic preparation, experience and motivation” (p. 27).

Mission

According to Cross (1988) the mission of America’s community colleges consists of “five major themes or foci” that “run through the current community college debate,” (p. 36). Cross identified these as: 1) the comprehensive focus, 2) vertical focus, 3) the horizontal focus, 4) the integrated focus and the remedial focus. (p. 36).

Cross (1988) identified the five traditional programs of the comprehensive focus by referencing Cohen and Brawer (1982) chapter titles that were found in

Cross (1988) states that the vertical focus centers on the “emphasizing the transfer function of the comprehensive mission” by “establishing relationships with high schools to ensure that recent high school graduates are prepared for college level work and for articulating with four-year institutions their requirements for transfer.” (p. 38).

The horizontal focus, according to Cross, requires that community colleges reach out to develop and to establish “linkages” outside the college with the community and its industries with them learning a “full partner in the educational mission.” (p. 40).

According to Cross (1988), the integrated focus is where linkages are made within the college rather than establishing external linkages. The colleges that emphasize the integrated focus would be “emphasizing multi-disciplinary courses, team teaching, and curriculum development across departmental lines and in general would follow many of the current proposals being generated for the improvement of general education in higher education.” (p. 43).

Cross (1988) indicated that the remedial focus is where community colleges become “all service institutions” offering not only academic services but also non-academic services. (p. 44). These include “guidance, job preparation, job placement, referral to other community agencies for help with legal and medical advice, apprenticeships, and almost any other type of service needed by young people to help them become responsible and productive citizens.” (p. 44).

**Functions**

Donovan (1988) states two primary functions of the community and junior colleges are developmental and preparatory education. Developmental education that is provided by public community colleges and junior colleges are “…courses, services and learning environments for under-prepared students…”
The goal in determining developmental education in community colleges has been to: 1) assist students identified and improve their learning skills thereby improving the student’s self-esteem, 2) provide general education that develops intellectual skills and positive civic and moral goals, 3) offer students opportunities to participate in a wide variety of educational and cultural offerings, and 4) provide quality guidance programs for a diverse student population.

The preparatory education function of public community colleges and junior colleges provides students with 1) vocational-technical and occupational educational programs that offer certificates and degree programs that allow students to earn entry-level employability credentials; i.e., A.S. in nursing with holding the door open for further study at a four-year college or university, and 2) “Education for Transfer”, (2+2), preparing students to extend their education to a four-year institution. (L. Bender, Lecture Notes, 1982).

Curriculum

The curriculum of U.S. public community colleges and junior colleges consists of the four components: The first is occupational programs of study (i.e. certificates, associate of science, and associate of applied science degrees in para-professional, technical-vocational or health related profession areas. Those programs were designed to be technical vocational and terminal in nature. The payoff for graduates from programs would result in entry-level employability for graduates in vocational and occupational areas such as agriculture, business, engineering, trades, public services and nursing; the second is the general education curriculum centered on promoting lifelong learning and community education with an emphasis on reading, writing, social studies, physical education, physical sciences and humanities; the third is the transfer education curriculum is designed to parallel courses that are required to graduate from a four-year college or university. Articulation is the key component of the transfer education curriculum. The authors point out the success of the State of Florida’s 2+2 Program between its community college system and state university system; the fourth is continuing, or adult, education. This curriculum component was
designed to accommodate and meet the educational needs of part-time non-traditional learners.

*Issues*

Articulation, open door admission remediation “how much or too little”, general education versus vocational-technical education, diversity, hindrances to learning and tuition “raise it” are issues that have been affecting U.S. public community colleges and junior colleges. With respect to the context and focus of this study, Cohen and Brawer (2003), identified issues that are affecting vocational education. The authors point out that “The terminology of vocational education has never been exact: the words terminal, vocational, technical, semi-professional, occupational and career have all been used interchangeably, or in combination, as in vocational technical” (p. 222).

The authors pose the following questions: “Can vocational education be effectively merged with the collegiate function?” and “can staff itself do it?” Cohen and Brawer (2003) stated that “the lines between vocational and collegiate education have become blurred…” because there have been”… as many students transferring to universities from community college career programs as from the so-called transfer programs” (p. 251). The authors go on to say that “…conceptual differences between occupational and liberal studies have often been raised, but the answers yielded little to influence program design in the community colleges.” (p. 251).

Cohen and Brawer (2003) also raise the issue of whether industries should in part provide support to community college programs that prepare students to work in their industries. Also they ask, “…how can industry be assigned its proportionate share of all training costs? What channels can be opened to merge public and private funds so that an equitable share is borne by each?” (p. 251).

The authors conclude that “the full effects of vocational education as a primary function have yet to be discerned.” (p. 255). The public’s perception of community colleges”… “as agents of upward mobility for individuals seems to be shifting toward a view of the institutions as occupational training centers.” Cohen
and Brawer (2003) state that “this narrowing of the colleges’ comprehensiveness could lead to a shift in the pattern of support.” (p. 251).

Community and junior college programs in public administration can be designed for transfer purposes or for preparing students for entry-level occupations, thus meeting both the horizontal and vertical focuses of the institutions. It is possible that the students are representative of the “fourth generation” diverse populations of the colleges. (Deegan, 1988). The programs can link the needs of students with the need of governmental and community agencies for a prepared and educated workforce.
CHAPTER 3
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

This study’s conceptual framework and its aspects of the division of labor, articulation, and accreditation were derived from Bana and Emory’s 1998 article about community colleges and associate degree programs in public administration. According to these authors, the community college is often overlooked as a source for public administration education. They stated that the community college is the place for providing entry-level public administration education to the “vast cadre of operation-level public employees” (p. 225) and that community colleges need to provide “a straight forward and seamless transfer program” (p. 225).

The aspects of this study’s conceptual framework, the division of labor, articulation, and accreditation, as well as how they relate to this study, are described and explained below.

Division of Labor

The purpose of the following discussion is to provide a conceptual basis of and descriptive understanding of what is meant by the term division of labor with regard to the context of this study. The discussion will also explain where, when, and why the division of labor emerged in U.S. government and its relationship to training in public administration education in the U.S.

Jones (1986) described and explained Emile Durkeim’s division of labor concept to be a social and economic value relationship that is characterized as an interdependent and interlocking systematic collective function of a civilized society.

Researchers in public administration education agree that the reason for the rise of the division of labor in terms of the utilization of public administration education in federal, state, and local governmental organizations in the U.S. is traced from the turn of this century to the present. The growth and development
of the division of labor in public administration education is attributed in part to certain political, economic, and social events in the U.S.

According to Mosher (1975) and Stone and Stone (1975), in the civic and municipal reform period of the progressive era (1888-1928), the city manager position became utilized in the professional administration of city council’s public policy decisions in cities in the U.S. The growth and development of intergovernmental agency-sponsored legislative programs such as the New Deal of the 1930s (e.g., Social Security Act, public works bills), the activities associated with World War II (e.g. Office of Price Administration), the immediate post-World War II era (e.g. the Marshall Plan), the Korean War, the Great Society programs of the 1960s and early 1970s (e.g. the model cities programs and civil rights legislation), the Vietnam war, and the Watergate scandal are considered to be the contributory benchmark events. These events caused federal, state, and local governmental organizations in the U.S. to develop new types and levels of professional and paraprofessional governmental jobs that provided general (e.g. management, coordinator, director) and or specialized (e.g. technician, analyst, aide) administrative support skills to cope with the ever-growing administrative and legal demands and requirements of government.

The Atlas of Florida, (1996) indicated that through the 1980s and early 1990s, state and local government employment grew in Florida by varying degrees. Florida had experienced nearly a one-third increase in the number of governmental professional and paraprofessional jobs because of high population growth coupled with citizen demands for more governmental service in such areas as education, environmental management, and law enforcement.

Researchers in public administration education reported that federal, state, and local governmental organizations had traditionally and primarily been the work place where public administration education had been utilized to carry out or administer policies and programs of elected and appointed public officials for the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of United States government. The bureaucracy is the best term that collectively identifies what, when, where,
and how elected public officials’ public policy initiatives and directives are produced and processed.

Gordon (1978) stated that according to Max Weber, a German sociologist, a governmental bureaucracy is a complex administrative organization that is governed by certain rules and regulations and is composed of and influenced by the following components.

The division of labor and functional specialization is work that is divided according to type and purpose, with clear areas of jurisdiction marked out for each working unit and an emphasis on eliminating overlap and duplication of functions. A hierarchy is a clear vertical chain of command in which each unit is subordinate to the one above it and superior to the one below it. A formal framework of rules and procedures is designed to ensure stability, predictability, and impersonality in bureaucratic operations, and thus equal treatment for all who deal with the organization. It also ensures reliability of performance. Maintenance of files and other records ensures that actions taken are both appropriate to the situation and consistent with past actions in similar circumstances. Professionalization exists when employees are (a) appointed (not elected) on the basis of their job-related skills, (b) full-time and career oriented, and (c) paid a regular salary and provided with a retirement pension (p. 158).

In the context of a governmental bureaucracy in the U.S., the division of labor can best be described as those persons classified as professional or paraprofessional generalists or specialists who work within the bureaucratic organizations of the United States government at the federal, state, and local levels. Public administration education researchers are in agreement about the characteristics associated with persons who work as generalists or specialists in governmental bureaucracies in the U.S.

Generalists are persons who are responsible for carrying out certain duties and tasks in a general and or specialized supervisory manner, depending on the level or degree of difficulty and specialization. Generalists have a greater
sphere of focus, influence, responsibility, and control in bureaucratic organizations (Thompson, 1961). Thompson also noted that generalists are usually the managers or department or division heads of governmental bureaucratic organizations. Persons at the generalist level possess certain training and experience.

According to the U.S. Department of Labor’s Occupational Outlook Handbook (2004), the chief executive officer of a local government, such as a city manager, must possess a master’s degree in public administration or its equivalent in order to compete for employment vacancies and, once hired, must be able to carry out general broad-based policy management duties and tasks of an elective city council. City managers act as generalists because they must be able to exercise independent judgment with respect to decision making. Their duties and responsibilities also require them to be able to administer and supervise programs and services of a city, i.e., personnel and public works.

Specialists are best described as those individuals within a governmental bureaucratic organization in the U.S. who are classified as support staff, such as aides, assistants, or technicians (Thompson, 1961). Specialists are employees that are limited by their role, realm of responsibility, and sphere of supervision within a governmental bureaucratic organization because of various factors such as limited training and experience and the hierarchical nature of their positions. The duties and tasks of specialists are particularistic in nature. For example, specialists are charged with carrying out a specific task or series of uniform or varied tasks for the organization that are supportive and of an administrative or operational in nature. Specialists are usually required to assist, confer, prepare, study, monitor, verify, and maintain records. Usually specialists must seek approval from a higher authority in a bureaucracy with respect to decisions.

Generalists and specialists who are employed in governmental bureaucratic organizations in the U.S. are also identified by their designated job title classification (e.g., Engineer IV versus Engineering Technician) and perform professional or paraprofessional job functions.
Mosher (1980) termed a professional as someone with a distinct, specialized occupation (e.g., accountant, educator, or engineer) who normally has completed four years of college “which offers a lifetime career to the person in it” (p. 176). A paraprofessional, by contrast, is an occupational status that allows a person to be employed with the specific purpose of assisting a professional even though that person is not a member of the profession (e.g., a paralegal who assists a lawyer).

Persons with doctoral, masters, bachelors, and associate degrees in public administration are employed in both the private (business) and public (government) sectors of the U.S. labor economy (U.S. Department of Labor, 2000-2001). According to NASPAA’s 1983 policy document on doctoral education in public affairs and public administration, the doctoral degree in public administration (i.e., Ph.D., D.P.A.) is the entry-level credential required for positions in teaching or research in private or public institutions of higher education in the U.S. (pp. 1-2). There are also positions in the federal, state, and local levels of government that require doctoral training or use it as an equivalent for experience. For example, the state of Florida’s departments of Education and Children and Family Services are public governmental organizations that employ persons with doctorates in top-level official and administrative positions such as district administrators and program directorships.

According to NASPAA’s MPA degree brochure, master’s degrees in public administration, as commonly known, are primarily required for entry-level leadership positions in U.S. government e.g., program manager, budget analyst, or legislative assistant. Swain (1985) stated that the bachelor’s degree in public administration has traditionally been an entry-level credential required for positions that provide direct service delivery support for U.S. governmental organizations (p. 311). For example, according to the State of Florida’s Department of Management Services, applicants for positions like fiscal officers and personnel specialists are required to have training and experience equivalent
to a bachelors degree from a four-year college or university in public administration.


Articulation

The discussion now turns to articulation and how it relates to two-year and four-year U.S. public colleges and universities. Based on the literature reviewed, the term articulation means that there is a legally based policy, rule, or unwritten consent agreement between two-year colleges and four-year colleges or universities.

Generally, such agreements allow students with associate degrees who have completed a general education core curriculum in a community or junior college to be admitted with full transfer credit as juniors into an upper-division program of study at a four-year college or university. Florida’s Administrative Code, Chapter 6A-10.024 (1999), requires that every member of the state university system and each of the state’s community colleges “shall plan and adopt policies and procedures to provide articulated programs so that students can proceed toward their educational objectives as rapidly as their circumstances permit” (p. 193). Also, pursuant to the same chapter under subsection (3)(a), “every state university and community college must provide for a general education core curriculum that requires at least 36 semester hours of college credit in the liberal arts and sciences for students working toward a baccalaureate” (p. 194).
In the state of Florida, according to the Department of Education’s Division of Community Colleges, after a community college or state university publishes its general education core curriculum, other public community colleges and state universities must recognize and honor that curriculum. The Florida Administrative Code 6A-10.024 (3) (b) indicates that once a student’s community college or state university transcript has certified that the student has satisfactorily completed the general education core curriculum requirement, regardless of whether the student has been awarded an associate degree, “no other state university or community college to which the student may transfer shall require any further such general education courses” (p. 194). However, subsection 3(c) of this code also indicates that if a student fails to complete a general education core curriculum prior to transferring to another community college, it then “becomes the responsibility of the new institution” (p. 194).

Accreditation

The purpose of the following discussion is to describe and explain the term *accreditation* and how it relates to this study. According to Selden (1965), accreditation is “the primary method by which higher education provides its own self-governance. It is an extralegal operation conceived by educational organizations and professional associations of different types of composition” (p. 214). For example, Selden described two types of accreditation bodies that affect the overall institutional quality of colleges and universities in the U.S. First, there are six regional associations of colleges and schools such as the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools that, according to Selden, “are only concerned with assessing the overall goals and objectives and the overall operations of a postsecondary institution such as a university, four-year college or two-year college” (p. 215).

Selden (1965) called the second type of accreditation body *professional*. The American Bar Association is an example of a professional accrediting organization that is national in operation and is primarily interested in overseeing “the education of the future members of the respective profession (law) and that
the professions will not be debased by the addition of incompetently educated members” (p. 215).

Selden (1965) also pointed out that professional accrediting bodies “limit their attention to specific programs of study of an academic institution” (p. 215). He reported that

“Professional accreditation bodies rely on the regional association’s judgment as to what the institution’s overall quality is, while directing their attention to reviewing a specific program of study and program support factors, e.g., admission standards for students, faculty competence, financial resources, and physical plant.” (p. 215).

As reported previously in this study’s review of the literature, NASPAA is recognized by COPA as a specialized accrediting body that is empowered to accredit masters degree programs in public administration and public affairs. In addition, NASPAA has provided its member institutions with directories, guidelines, policies, and standards for undergraduate and graduate programs in public affairs and public administration. ASPA is recognized in the literature reviewed as the educational and professional membership organization that promotes the value and virtues of the study and practice of public administration. ASPA offers its members opportunities to attend conferences, workshops, and receive publications about public administration.

The primary reason for conducting this research is that associate degree programming in public administration has been largely ignored. For instance, the role and purposes of associate degree education in public administration has not been previously studied, especially regarding this study’s purposes, research questions, and conceptual framework. Secondly, there are gaps and conflicting information about associate degree programs in public administration. In 2002, for the first time, NASPAA listed associate degree programs in public administration on its website. NASPAA indicated, according to the College Blue Book (1995) that there were 28 U.S. community and junior colleges in 17 states that offered associate degrees in public administration. But, Peterson’s Two-Year Colleges (2002) guide indicated that there were 42 public community and
junior colleges in 22 states that offered associate degree programs in public administration. Therefore, this research was needed to provide current data that filled the informational gaps that existed regarding associate degree programming in public administration. Also, this study provided never-reported and newly-reported information about associate degree programming in public administration to ASPA and NASPAA for their own respective research and reference purposes.

Of the four research questions posed for this study, questions 1 - 3 will be asked and answered with respect to the aspects of this study’s conceptual framework:

1. What niches or groups of the public sector are being primarily by graduates of associate degree programs in public administration?
2. What curriculum subject areas are emphasized in associate degree programs in public administration?
3. In what kinds of public service positions are associate degree graduates in public administration employed?
CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the research methodology used for this study. The study: 1) provided empirical data about certain aspects of associate degree programs in public administration offered by U.S. community and junior colleges at the time of the study; 2) determined the emphasis of associate degree programming in public administration and how that degree was being utilized at the time of the study; and 3) determined what changes were taking place in public administration associate degree programs offered by U.S. public community and junior colleges at the time of the study. The chapter also describes the study design, population, survey instrument, and data treatment procedures.

Design of the Study

The study gathered descriptive data through use of a survey instrument. A descriptive study was deemed appropriate as it would provide standardized, quantifiable data about a given population at one point in time (Borg & Gall, 1989).

Fowler (1988) discussed the appropriateness of a survey instrument because it permits the researcher to “obtain information not systematically available elsewhere or in the form needed for analysis” (p. 17). Therefore, the design for this study was not experimental and it did not involve the manipulation of any variable. The researcher tabulated the responses and reported the responses by the respondents to the survey questions.

Population

The population for this study was identified in the 2002 edition of Peterson’s Two Year Colleges. Peterson’s Two Year Colleges, alone, was used because neither the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) nor the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA)
had a current record of directory data about associate degree programs in public administration. Also, public administration researchers such as Daniels and Johansen had previously used another Peterson publication for conducting their survey research.

Listed were 42 public community and junior colleges, located in 22 states in the U.S., that offered associate degree programs in public administration. After contacting all 42 public community and junior colleges that were listed, it turned out that only twenty colleges from that list, in fact, offered an associate degree program in public administration. Those twenty schools were identified as the sample that was surveyed for this study (see Appendix B).

Survey Instrument

The questions posed and the response scales used in this study’s survey instrument were derived from the review of the literature. Most were patterned after those found in Swain’s study of bachelors degree programs in public administration (1985). Swain’s study reported the percentages of and the commonality and variety that existed amongst U.S. public and private four-year colleges and universities with respect to courses offered, types of bachelor’s degrees offered, and the kinds and levels of employment obtained by recent graduates entering public service.

The instrument used in this study consisted of three parts and included a total of 10 questions (see Appendix A). Part 1, consisting of survey questions (SQ) 1 - 5, asked respondents for their program enrollment numbers; whether their enrollment had been increasing or decreasing; for numbers of full-time teaching faculty in their program; for the name of groups in the public sector being served by associate degree programs in public administration; and to identify curriculum subject areas emphasized in their program. Part 2 consisted of SQ numbered 6 - 9. These questions sought responses pertaining to this study’s conceptual framework of the division of labor, articulation, and accreditation. Part 3 consisted of SQ 10. This question asked the respondents to identify any transitions their programs were undergoing and to provide any
other information they deemed important with consideration of this study’s purpose.

Validity and Reliability

According to Tuckman (1978), a major problem of research and evaluation is getting accurate measures of the variable of concern. Two measures of credibility are validity—measuring what we intend to measure—and reliability—measuring consistently what we intend to measure as represented by content validity.

Instrument Validity

Dillman (1978) said “the way to establish validity of a survey instrument is that it should be tested or evaluated by a group of similarly trained professionals who understand the study’s purpose, including the hypothesis to be tested” (p. 158). He also stated similarly trained professionals offer invaluable information, thereby providing “feedback not available from any other group” (p. 157).

To establish validity for this study, similarly trained professionals (STPs) were asked to evaluate the survey instrument. The doctoral committee for this study had expertise in community and junior college education and research methods in public administration. They were from the departments of educational leadership and public administration at Florida State University. They were asked to evaluate the instrument for content accuracy, item clarity, and relevance to the study’s purposes and research questions. This was accomplished by asking the STPs to answer the following questions regarding the survey instrument.

1) Did you understand all of the questions asked?
   Yes ___  No ___  If no, which ones(s) were not understood?

2) Please evaluate this instrument regarding item clarity:
   very clear ___  clear ___  unclear ___.

3) Please evaluate this instrument regarding content accuracy:
   very accurate ___  accurate ___  inaccurate
4) Did you find the instrument to be relevant to the study’s: purpose(s) Yes ___ No ___ and research questions Yes ___ No ___.

5) How would you change this instrument if you were using it?

Modifications were made according to their recommendations. They recommended different word choices and changes in question content and format.

*Content Validity*

To establish the content validity of this study’s instrument, the STP’s were also asked to assess and determine, based upon their review, the content validity of this study’s survey instrument. The STP’s determined after their review that each question, as presented in the instrument, meant the same thing to each of them.

*Data Collection Procedures*

Originally the data collection procedure for this study was to mail a questionnaire with a cover letter explaining the purpose, usefulness of the survey and the importance of the survey being returned. However, there was no information available on who were the community college and junior college program directors for public administration degree programs. The researcher telephoned those forty-two schools listed in the 2002 edition of Peterson’s *Two Year Colleges* in order to identify the program directors of those colleges who offered an associate degree program in public administration. After compiling the list and phone numbers of the directors of the existing twenty programs, it became apparent that administering a telephone survey would be more effective and efficient in terms of achieving a greater response rate to the survey since mailed questionnaires could be ignored, discarded, lost, and cause time delays or lapses in data collection.

It was decided after reviewing *Public Program Analysis Applied Research Methods* by Theodore H. Poister that a telephone survey would be instituted.
Poister (1978) stated "In general, telephone surveys present an efficient means to obtaining answers to a few short, direct, non-sensitive questions of fact or fairly straightforward attitude and opinion type questions." (p. 332). Poister also said telephone surveys "work best with cut-and-dried question sequences that are easily understood and answerable..." (p. 332). The questionnaire for this study fit Poister's criteria.

The telephone survey was conducted over a ten-day period in accordance with each program director's schedule. Each telephone interview lasted for ten to fifteen minutes. All twenty of the program directors agreed to respond to the telephone survey. The telephone survey consisted of ten questions that required contained responses or short answers from the program directors. A mid-western college respondent did not answer question five of the survey, and after conducting additional follow up the respondent still did not provide data to that question. Another mid-western college program director preferred to record his responses on a hard copy of the survey. The interviewer faxed a copy of the survey to the program director. The program director completed the survey and returned it by fax.

Each of the program directors responses to the ten-question survey that were posed by the researcher were verified between the researcher and the program director before the program directors responses were hand recorded by the researcher.

The sample size for this study was 20 respondents. In some cases, all 20 respondents provided data to the questions posed. However, in some cases fewer than 20 of the respondents provided information to the questions asked. Those 20 respondents that did not provide data to every question asked was a result of not having the information available, or on file.

Descriptive statistical techniques such as: tabulations were used to establish frequency, percentages and means, together with appropriate tables and graphs were used to describe the data that were derived from this study’s survey responses.
Human Subjects Committee Approval

An application for the use of human subjects in research was submitted to and approved by The Florida State University Human Subjects Committee. Appendix C contains a copy of the approval form. Participants were assured of anonymity, as results were reported in the aggregate. Following completion of this research, the surveys will be kept on file for two years and then destroyed.

Data Treatment Procedures

In the following chapter, the responses to the four research questions are described in terms of frequency and percentages together with appropriate tables and graphs. The research questions examined for this study are the following. Each question is accompanied by a reference to the corresponding survey-related question or questions (SRQ).

1. What niches or groups of the public sector are being primarily served by graduates of associate degree programs in public administration? [SRQ = 1-4]
2. What curriculum subject areas are emphasized in associate degree programs in public administration? [SRQ = 5]
3. In what kinds of public service positions are associate degree graduates in public administration employed? [SRQ = 6-7]
4. What changes are taking place in associate degree programs in public administration that are offered by U.S. public community colleges? [SRQ = 10]

Questions 8-9 in the survey were utilized to obtain additional information and were analyzed as to frequency of responses.
CHAPTER 5
RESULTS

This chapter reports the data that were obtained by conducting a telephone survey. The results are presented in the order of the research questions posed for the study, except when varying or departing from the questionnaire format is believed to give the reader a better understanding of the data being presented.

Demographics
The sample surveyed for this study was identified in the Peterson's Two Year Colleges (2002). Telephone inquiries were made to all 42 program directors of U.S. public community and junior colleges, in 22 states, that were listed in Peterson's as offering an associate degree program in public administration. After making contact with representatives at those 42 schools, only 20 schools, in fifteen states confirmed offering an associate degree program in public administration. Figure 1 shows the 15 states in which 20 schools are offering an associate degree in public administration in U.S. public community and junior colleges.

Figure 1. Fifteen states offering associate degree programs in public administration.
The twenty respondents were asked in SQ 2(a) to indicate how many students were enrolled either full-time or part-time in their programs. In question 2(b), respondents were also asked what best characterizes the present enrollment for their programs: rapid growth, moderate growth, no change, or declining enrollment. Based upon the 20 responses, as of December 15, 2002 there was a total of 766 full time students and 344 part time students enrolled in associate degree programs in public administration in U.S. public community and junior colleges. None of the respondents characterized their student enrollments as undergoing rapid growth, seven respondents (35%) reported moderate growth, nine (45%) reported no change, and four (20%) reported declining enrollments.

According to the respondents those programs that were experiencing moderate growth in student enrollments attributed that growth to increases in their state’s population, new business starts, and growth in employment opportunities in government agencies. Also, the respondents indicated they were receiving institutional as well as community support for their programs, plus government agencies in the surrounding areas were providing employment opportunities and some of those government agencies were connected with their program because of their participation on their program’s advisory board. Some of the reasons given by some of the respondents that had reported that their programs were experiencing declining student enrollments were attributed to their institutions change in their mission which then resulted in their college being unable to provide adequate program support or fiscal support. Also those program directors had indicated that there was a lack of community awareness about their programs and their locale lacked employment opportunities for their graduates.

Survey question 3 asked the respondents to report how many full-time faculty members teach in their programs. Nineteen out of 20 program directors interviewed reported a total of 43 full-time, or 2.2 average per institution (API), of full-time faculty members who teach substantially in associate degree programs.
in public administration. The only institution to report having no full-time faculty was a mid-western community college. The program director indicated that other departments throughout the college shared faculty members to teach public administration courses.

Research Questions

Research Question 1: What niches or groups of the public sector are being primarily served by associate degree programs in public administration?

Sixteen (80%) of the 20 respondents to this study provided data about what niches or groups of the public sector are being primarily served by associate degree programs in public administration. Survey question 7(c) of this study asked the respondents, in their best estimates, approximately what percentage of their employed graduates work in the following: federal government, state government, local government, not-for-profit organizations, or other. The Figure 2 bar graph provides the percentage of what niches or groups are being served by associate degree programs in public administration.

Figure 2. Niches or groups primarily served by associate degree programs in public administration. n=16
Local government was reported as serving the highest percentage (29.75%) of the public sector by associate degree programs in public administration. Respondents reported serving state government at (25.75%), other groups at (26.38%), not-for-profit groups at (12.06%), and the federal government at (6.06%). Local, state, and federal governmental agencies collectively accounted for 61.56% of the niches or groups that are primarily being served by associate degree programs in public administration. The other category, based on the data collected from the 16 respondents, identified health care administration and business organizations sectors as being the groups or niches where graduates work with an associate degree in public administration (see Appendix C).

Table 1. Mean %, range %, and standard deviation of the niches and groups served by the associate degree programs in public administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NICHES &amp; GROUPS</th>
<th>MEAN %</th>
<th>RANGE %</th>
<th>STANDARD DEVIATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>29.75</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26.38</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>32.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>25.75</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit Groups</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formula: \[ s = \sqrt{\frac{\sum (x_i - \bar{x})^2}{n - 1}} \]

Regarding research question number 1, the respondents were asked in SQ 7(a) for the percentage of their graduates employed in public service jobs following graduation. Thirteen of the twenty respondents (65%) estimated the percentage of their graduates who were employed in public service jobs following graduation. Their responses ranged from one respondent indicating that five percent (5%) of the his program’s graduates found employment in public service jobs following graduation, while two respondents reported that 100% of their graduates found employment in public service jobs following graduation. Based
on the average of the percentages reported by the 13 respondents, 60.7% of the students who graduated with an associate degree in public administration found employment in public service jobs following graduation.

Survey question 7(b) asked respondents to report what percentage of their graduates supervised others. Data were obtained from 14 (70%) of the 20 respondents who answered that question. Responses ranged from 0% to 75% who indicated that their graduates supervised others. Based on the average of the percentages reported by the colleges, 33% of the graduates with an associate degree in public administration supervised others.

In summary, state, local, and federal levels of U.S. government were identified as the primary niches where the associate degree in public administration was being utilized. Also, an average of 60% of the students who graduated with an associate degree in public administration were employed in public service jobs after their graduation. And, an average of 33% of graduates with an associate degree in public administration supervised others.

*Research Question 2: What curriculum subject areas are emphasized in associate degree programs in public administration?*

Nineteen out of 20 respondents provided data to questions 5(a) and (b) of the survey. One respondent did not provide information, even after following up with him, about what subject areas were emphasized in his program. The respondents were asked in question 5(a) to indicate how much emphasis their programs placed on each of the following 10 curriculum subject areas: political and legal institutions and processes, economic and social institutions and processes, organization and management concepts and behavior supervisory skills, policy and program formulation, implementation and evaluation decision-making and problem-solving, human resources, budgeting and financial processes, information resources, including computer literacy and applications, and management of non-profit organizations.

They also were asked to refer to the following definitions in characterizing the degree of emphasis with regard to SQ 5(a): none denoted no mention of the
topic in any courses; slight meant occasional mention of the topic in one or more courses; moderate equaled total coverage equivalent to two or more weeks of a standard three-semester credit (or equivalent) course; and substantial stated that total coverage is equivalent to half or more of the subject matter of a three-semester credit (or equivalent) course.

The following table shows the frequency of responses and percentages of the curriculum subject areas emphasized in the programs of 19 respondents. The program directors were to indicate what degree of emphasis was given, i.e., substantial, moderate, slight, or none as to their definitions to each of the 10 subject area items.

**Table 3.** Frequencies of responses and percentages of curriculum subject area emphasis for 19 of 20 programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Substantial</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Slight</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Budgeting and Financial Processes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Political and Legal Institutions and Processes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.63</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Organization and Management Concepts and Behavior</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Decision Making and Problem Solving</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Information Resources, including Computer Literacy and Applications</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Economic and Social Institutions and Processes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Human Resources</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Supervisory Skills</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Policy and Program Formulation, Implementation and Evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Management of Non-profit Organizations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=19 and percentages for each subject area emphasis total 100%

*n=equates to frequency of responses*
The following five curriculum subject areas were frequently cited for substantial emphasis by 19 out of 20 program directors in their programs of studies: budgeting and financial processes (52.63%); political and legal institution and processes (52.63%); organization and management concepts and behavior (47.37%); decision making and problem solving (47.37%); information resources, including computer literacy and applications (42.11%); human resources (36.84%); and supervisory skills (36.84%). The following three subject areas were cited most frequently by the 19 respondents as being moderately emphasized subject areas in their programs of study: economic and social institution and processes (68.42%); and policy and program formulation implementation, and evaluation (47.37%); organization and management concepts and behavior (36.84%). The following three curriculum subject areas were identified by the program directors as having received a slight emphasis in their programs of study were: management of non-profit organizations (47.36%); budgeting and financial processes (36.84%); and policy and program formulation, implementation and evaluation (31.58%). Lastly, the following curriculum subject areas were identified by some program directors as not being emphasized in their program of studies: management of non-profit organizations (26.32%, supervisory skills (10.52%), human resources (5.26%), information resources including computer literacy and applications (5.26%), decision making and problem solving (5.26%), and organization and management concepts and behavior (5.26%).

Question 5(b) of the survey asked respondents to indicate yes or no to the question: Does your program offer students on-line distance learning opportunities? Eleven out of the 19 respondents (57%) indicated that their programs do offer on-line distance learning courses or programs in public administration. Eight out of the 19 respondents (43%) indicated that their programs do not offer students on-line distance learning opportunities.

The reasons that those program directors gave as to why their programs did not offer online distance learning were attributed to either their campus was
not wired or hooked-up yet for offering distance learning courses or programs. Another reason given was because online distance learning was not an approved budget item for their program of study.

*Research Question 3: In what kinds of public service positions are associate degree graduates in public administration employed?*

For the purposes of this study, the term “occupational areas” means public service positions. Eighteen of the 20 respondents surveyed provided information about the kinds of occupational areas where associate degree graduates from U.S. public community or junior colleges were working. Survey question six of this study asked respondents to identify these occupational areas in which substantial numbers of their graduates were employed: direct service delivery, financial, planning and policy development, human resources staff, informational and computer, and other. Those occupational areas of direct service delivery or other involved direct client contact or benefit services. Of the 18 respondents, 10 respondents indicated that the other category was number one on the list of what kinds of public service occupational areas where their graduates worked. Direct service delivery was second with 7 of the 18 respondents reporting. The human resources staff and financial categories were equally number three with six of the 18 respondents. According to four of the 18 program directors, planning and policy development was fourth. The informational and computer category finished fifth in the listing, with two of 18 program directors responding with regards to the kinds of service occupational areas where graduates with an associate degree in public administration are employed.

*Table 4. Occupational Areas*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Service Delivery</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources Staff</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning/Policy Development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informational/Computer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 18
Research Question 4: What changes are taking place in associate degree programs in public administration that are offered by U.S. public community colleges?

All 20 respondents answered question 10(a) of the survey, concerning whether or not their programs were undergoing changes. Seventeen out of the 20 respondents answered yes to the question. Three of the 20 respondents stated that no changes were taking place in their programs. The program directors responding in the affirmative were asked to choose from any or all of the ten factors that were related to the changes. Two mid-western community colleges, of the 17 respondents who answered yes that their programs were undergoing program changes, however, they did not respond to what program change factors were affecting their degree programs. Table 4 presents the number of programs that are undergoing changes related to the ten factors.

Table 5. Program change factors as to frequency of responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic changes in student population</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in student enrollment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in community support for their programs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in employment opportunities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in student enrollment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in institutional financial support</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in mission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in institutional financial support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in employment opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in community support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n=15

According to the 15 program directors’ frequency of responses, the top four factors that are affecting changes in U.S. public community colleges offering associate degree programs are: a) demographic changes in student population, b) increased student enrollment, c) an increase in community support, and d) an
increase in employment opportunities. The program directors were also asked, in question 10(b), to provide any other key information that they believed would be helpful for a better understanding of their programs. Ten (50%) of the 20 respondents provided information they believed would be helpful for a better understanding of their programs.

Three program directors indicated that their associate degree programs in public administration were located in their colleges’ business schools. A southern community college’s program director stated that a public service ethics course was being developed and that the program’s curriculum was being revised to include business, social science, and public service courses. A southern community college program director also indicated that there was a revision taking place in his program's curriculum. According to this program director, the curriculum changes would include an infusion of twenty-first century skills across the general education curriculum based on what public employers wanted; i.e. team building, technology, work ethic, and problem solving skills.

Another southern community college program director indicated that as older faculty members retire, new faculty will be hired to replace them. Additionally, another southern community college program director also indicated that a large number of its faculty was scheduled to retire. A southwestern community college program director reported that colleagues at that institution were working to increase internship opportunities for students who were without public sector work experience. A western community college director indicated that his institution’s program was working to focus on local government wants and needs. Another western community college program director indicated his institution would be hiring more full-time public administration faculty in the business school in order to meet the growth in student enrollment because a large number of U.S. Army enlisted personnel were enrolling in the institution’s on-line program.
Additional Survey Questions

All twenty respondents answered SQ 4(a) and (b). Question 4(a) asked the respondents for the emphasis of their program: entry-level employability, terminal degree purposes, and upper division transfer purposes. One (5%) of 20 program directors reported that his program's emphasis was entry-level employability and terminal degree purposes. Eight (40%) of the 20 respondents indicated that the emphasis of their programs was only for upper division transfer purposes. One respondent (5%) selected terminal degree purposes and upper division transfer purposes to describe his program. Five (25%) of the 20 respondents indicated that entry-level employability, terminal degree purposes, and upper division transfer purposes were the emphasis of their programs. Five (25%) of the 20 respondents selected entry-level employability and upper division transfer purposes as being the emphasis of their programs. In summary, 40% of the respondents indicated that the emphasis of their programs was only designed for upper division transfer purposes.

Question 4(b) of the survey directed the program directors to answer yes or no when asked whether the majority of their students were employed full-time in public service related jobs while studying in their programs. Fifteen (75%) of the respondents indicated that the majority of their students were not employed in full-time public service related jobs while enrolled in their programs. Five (25%) of the program directors indicated that the majority of their students worked in full time public service related jobs while enrolled in their programs.

The 20 respondents were asked in 8(a) to answer yes or no as to whether their associate degree program had an articulation process with one or more four-year colleges or universities that offers a bachelors degree in public administration. If the respondents answered yes to question 8(a), they were asked to check all that applied: articulated in context of state policy and rules, articulated through inter-written agreements, or informally. Sixteen (80%) of the 20 respondents answered yes, that their associate degree programs had an articulation process with a four-year college or university that offers a bachelors
degree in public administration. Four respondents (20%) answered no to this question. Five of the 16 respondents who answered yes indicated that they had an articulation process in the context of a state policy or rule. Four of the 16 respondents who answered yes said they had an articulation process through inter-written agreements. Three respondents indicated that they had an articulation process that is informal. The remaining four of the 16 respondents who answered yes to 8(a) indicated that they had an articulation process that is articulated in the context of state policy and rules and articulated through inter-written agreements.

All 20 respondents to the study answered either yes or no to the questions posed in 9(a), (b), or (c) of this study’s survey. The respondents were asked in question 9(a): Did your program, in developing your curriculum, make use of information derived from NASPAA? Sixteen (80%) of the program directors answered no they did not make use of information from NASPAA in developing their curriculum. Four program directors (20%) answered yes that they did make use of information derived from NASPAA when developing their curriculum for their associate degree program in public administration.

Question 9(b) asked the respondents whether their programs had a mission statement. Twelve (60%) of the respondents indicated their programs did have mission statements, which were reviewed. The mission statements of those associate of arts (transfer) degree programs indicated that their programs were located in departments or divisions of social sciences or liberal arts. The statements also indicated that their programs’ primary purpose is to provide students with academic preparation for careers in public service and to provide a degree that can be used to transfer into an upper division program at a four year college or university.

The mission statements of those programs that offer an associate of science or applied science (terminal) degree in public administration either in business or professional and technical education departments of their college indicated that the primary purpose of their program is designed for persons who
are currently working in federal, state or local government agencies. Another objective of those programs are designed to provide those individuals who are working in public sector employment with academic preparation that will "improve and upgrade" their skills while working in their public sector positions. The mission statements for those programs also indicated that their degree programs are also intended to provide academic training for those students who are seeking entry-level employment in public sector organizations or non-profit agencies.

The respondents were also asked in question 9(c): Does your program have a community advisory board? If yes, what functions do they serve? Eight (40%) out of the 20 respondents answered yes that their programs did have a community advisory board. Sixty (60%) of the 20 program directors indicated that their programs did not have a community advisory board. The general consensus among those program directors who answered yes was that the functions served by their boards were collaborative and consultative in nature, with most board members being from public sector leadership positions.

In conclusion, with respect to the data received from the additional survey questions posed for this study, 40% of the respondents said that their programs were designed only for upper division transfer proposes. With respect to students being employed full-time while attending school, the data showed that 75% of the respondents indicated that the majority of their students were not employed in full-time public service positions, while 25% of the respondents indicated that their students were employed full-time while enrolled in their programs. Eighty percent of the respondents answered yes, that their program had an articulation process with a four-year college or university that offered a bachelors degree in public administration. The most common form of articulation agreement reported by the respondents is articulated in context of state policy and rules. Sixteen (80%) of the program directors said that they did not make use of information from NASPAA in developing their curriculum. Twenty percent of the respondents indicated that they did use information from NASPAA while
developing their curriculum. Twelve (60%) of the respondents answered yes that their program had a mission statement, while eight (40%) of the program directors indicated no, that their program did not have a mission statement. Lastly, 60% of the 20 program directors indicated that their programs did not have a community advisory board, while 40% of the respondents indicated that their program did have a community advisory board. The program directors indicated that most of their community advisory board members came from public sector leadership positions, for example a southwestern community college reported that its advisory board members not only came from the public sector, but from the private sector as well. This college had members on its board from a major hospital corporation and a private human services agency, as well as members from federal, state, and local government agencies.
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter presents discussion of the results of the four research questions as reported by the program directors of associate degree programs at public community, and junior colleges throughout the United States as well as implications, recommendations and conclusions.

The purposes of this study were to provide new empirical data about certain aspects of associate degree programs in public administration that are offered by U.S. community and junior colleges, to determine the emphasis of associate degree programming in public administration, to determine how the associate degree in public administration is being utilized, and to determine what changes are taking place in associate degree programs in public administration. The aspects of this study's conceptual framework were the division of labor, and articulation and accreditation as they relate to associate degree programming in public administration.

Research Questions
The following research questions directed this study:

1. What niches or groups of the public sector are being primarily served by associate degree programs in public administration?
2. What curriculum subject areas are emphasized in associate degree programs in public administration?
3. In what kinds of public service positions are associate degree graduates in public administration employed?
4. What changes are taking place in associate degree programs in public administration that are offered by U.S. public community junior colleges?
Design of the Study

The U.S. Public Community and Junior College Associate Degree Programs in Public Administration survey was administered by telephone to the twenty program directors located in fifteen states who confirmed that their college offered an associate degree program in public administration. Institutions were selected based on their listing in the 2002 edition of Peterson's Two Year Colleges. This guide listed forty-two public community and junior colleges, located in twenty-two states that offered associate degree programs in public administration. However, after making personal telephone contact with each college that was listed as offering such a program, only twenty or forty-one percent of those listed actually confirmed that their college offered an associate degree in public administration. Those twenty program directors gave their consent to be a part of this study.

Data Collection

A telephone survey was conducted over a ten-day period to fit each program director's schedule. Each telephone interview lasted for ten to fifteen minutes. All twenty of the program directors agreed to respond to the telephone survey. The telephone survey consisted of ten questions that required contained responses or short answers from the program directors.

The program directors responses to the ten-question survey asked by the researcher were verified between the researcher and the program director before the program directors responses were hand recorded by the researcher. In some cases fewer than twenty of the respondents provided information to the questions asked. The twenty respondents who did not give data to every question asked was a result of them not having the information available to them or was not on file.

Descriptive statistical techniques such as tabulations to establish frequency, and percentages together with appropriate tables and graphs were used to describe the data that was derived from this study's survey responses.
Discussion

Research Question 1: What niches or groups of the public sector are being primarily served by associate degree programs in public administration?

The first research question concerned the niches or groups of the public sector that are being primarily served by associate degree programs in public administration. Survey question 7(c) of this study asked the respondents, based on their best estimates, approximately what percentage of their employed graduates work in federal state and local government, not-for-profit organizations, or other. The respondents reported that 61.56% of the graduates with an associate degree in public administration were employed in the three levels of U.S. government. Specifically, the local government accounted for 29.75%, the state level of government accounted for 25.75%, the local government level accounted for 29.6%, and the federal government level accounted for 6.06%.

The groups not for profit and other accounted for over one-third or 38.44% of the places where associate degrees in public administration were being utilized. The Other category as previously reported based on the data collected for this study, had indicated that graduates of associate degree programs in public administration were working in jobs in health care administration (Program Specialist -Health Maintenance) and in business organizations (Public Relations Representative) The results of this study support other research findings by Mosher (1978), Musolf and Seidman (1980), Poore (1982), and NASPAA (2005) that the public sector, namely state, local, and federal levels of U.S. government, are the primary niches or groups that are being served by associate, bachelors and masters degree programs in public administration. The U.S. Department of Labor's Occupational Outlook Handbook (2000) also reported that graduates with doctoral, masters, bachelors and associate degrees in public administration were employed in both the private (business) and public (government) sectors of the United States labor economy.
It is evident and conclusive from this study that the primary niches or groups that are being served by associate degree programs in public administration are state government (29.8%), local government (29.6%), and other government (25.8%). Also, the major findings derived from the data collected from survey questions 7(a) and 7(b) that relate to research question one are that an average of 60.7% of those students that graduate with an associate degree in public administration were employed in public service jobs following their graduation. The data collected also indicated that 33.3% of the graduates with an associate degree in public administration were employed in supervisory positions.

Research Question 2: What curriculum subject areas are emphasized in associate degree programs in public administration?

The respondents were asked in survey question 5(a) to indicate based on the definitions that were given to them regarding the degree of emphasis their program places on each of the following ten curriculum subject areas: political and legal institutions and processes, economic and social institutions and processes, organization and management concepts and behavior supervisory skills, policy and program formulation, implementation and evaluation decision-making and problem solving, human resources, budgeting and financial processes, information resources, including computer literacy and applications, and management of non-profit organizations.

The data for this study, like Swain's (1985) bachelor degree in public administration study showed that a "certain core subject matter" is also emphasized in associate degree programs in public administration. For example, the following five curriculum subject areas were the most frequently cited by program directors in this study as being substantially emphasized: budgeting and financial resources; political and legal institutions; organization and management concepts and behavior; decision making and problem solving; and, information resources, including computer literacy and applications.
According to Swain’s study (1985) those five core subject areas that were emphasized were public administration, organization and management, organizational behavior, public finance, budgeting and American government.

This study found that certain curriculum subject areas are emphasized in current associate degree programs in public administration. The data reviewed for this study also suggests that there are apparent limited similarities between associate degree (A.A., A.S.) programs in public administration and bachelor (B.A., B.S.) degree programs in public administration curriculum subject areas emphasis in their programs of study. In the following paragraph, those subjects that appear in parentheses were emphasized in Swain's study, while subjects that precede the parentheses are the results of this study, that show the curriculum subject areas that are emphasized in this study about associate degree programs.

For example, the following three curriculum subject areas that are identified as being substantially and similarly emphasized respectively in both associate degree programs and Swain's (1985) study about bachelor degree programs are: budgeting and financial processes (public finance and budgeting); legal institutions and processes (American government); and organization and management concepts and behavior (organization and management). However this study found that associate degree programs offered substantial to moderate subject area emphasis in decision making and problem solving, information resources including computer literacy and applications, and economic and social institutions and processes.

Since Swain's 1985 study, new courses in public administration have been developed and emphasized by colleges and universities offering degree programs in public administration. The reasons for these new developments in curriculum can be attributed to colleges responding to the new developments and demands by public sector employers in order to meet the ever increasing needs for addressing whatever social, economic, and political changes and challenges that beset the public sector in conducting their public programs.
Survey question 5(b) asked the program directors to answer yes or no as to whether their programs offered online distance learning opportunities. As previously reported fifty-seven percent of the nineteen respondents said yes, that they offered online distance learning programs. The remainder of the nineteen respondents or forty-three percent indicated that their program does not offer online distance learning. Some of the explanations given by those program directors who did not offer online distance learning were because of either their campuses were not wired or hooked-up yet or it was not an approved budget item for their program of study.

There have been studies about online distance learning regarding bachelor and masters degree programs in public administration. However, there have not been any studies to date about online distance learning and the associate degree program in public administration. According to NASPAA, there is no data on what percentage of four-year programs offer online distance learning in public administration. This study provides new data indicating over half of the associates degree programs had reported offering online distance learning opportunities.

Research Question 3: In what kinds of public service positions are associate degree graduates in public administration employed?

Survey question six of this study asked the respondents: In which of the following areas are substantial numbers of your graduates employed? Check all that apply: direct service delivery, other (undefined), human resource staff, financial, planning/policy development and informational/computer.

Based on 90% of the 20 respondents’ responses to survey question six of this study; those respondents indicated that substantial numbers of their graduates with an associate degree in public administration are employed respectively in the following kinds of public service occupational areas: direct service delivery involves providing client contact and client services benefits, other (undefined), human resource staff, financial, planning and policy development and informational and computer.
According to the literature reviewed for this study, Bana and Emory (1998) stated that the community college is the place for providing entry-level public administration education to the "vast cadre of operation level public employees" (p. 225). Research in public administration education reported that the three levels of U.S. government i.e. federal, state and local government organizations have traditionally been and are the primary places where public administration education has been utilized.

In summary, it is conclusive from the literature reviewed for this study and the data results from this study that graduates with an associate degree in public administration are working in various kinds of public service positions for different levels of federal, state and local government organizations. Hilty (2005) said through a personal communication by telephone that Lee County, Florida government utilizes the associate degree in public administration for paraprofessional, administrative and technical service support positions. Hilty (2005) further reported that the following job titles such as engineering technician, legal assistant, fiscal assistant, and planning technician are positions that are paraprofessional in nature that require an associate degree in public administration.

In essence, based on the listing derived from the responses of the eighteen out of the twenty respondents to the question, substantial numbers of graduates with an associate degree in public administration are employed respectively in the following areas: direct service delivery, other (undefined), human resources staff, financial, planning and policy development, and informational and computer.

Research Question 4: What changes are taking place in associate degree programs in public administration that are offered by U.S. public community junior colleges?

Based on the fifteen program directors' responses, the major program change that is taking place is demographic changes in student population. As an example, one community college program director indicated that they were
experiencing a large number of U.S. Army enlisted personnel enrolling in their on line program from world wide locations because the U.S. Army provides their enlistees/students with laptop computers in order for them to access courses and degree programs. Another program director stated that a large number of "middle level older" students working for local government organizations were enrolled in their programs because their employers provided tuition reimbursement to their employees as an incentive to begin, or return to college to upgrade their skills for jobs they held and or for promotional opportunities within their organizations. Another director indicated more females were enrolling into their public administration program. Other important changes affecting programs are an increase in student enrollment and an increase in community support for programs.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2003), the states of Arizona, California, Florida and Texas had been experiencing rapid growth in population, business, and government. Nearly half of the respondents indicated that their programs were experiencing an increase in student enrollment. Growth is especially strong in Arizona and Florida where directors reported that their programs were being subjected to changes because of increases in student enrollments. Other community colleges that indicated increases in their student enrollments were schools in the mid-west and northeast. Surprisingly, one community college program director in California reported that the program was experiencing a decrease in student enrollment.

A third of the respondents reported that an increase in employment opportunities was causing changes in their programs. Program directors from Arizona and Texas, who previously indicated increases in student enrollment and community support, also reported that more government jobs were available in their county and city government organizations because of the continued population growth in their respective areas. A southern community college program director also indicated an increase in employment opportunities as a program change factor.
In summary, according to the fifteen respondents the top four program change factors that are affecting their programs as reported were: demographic changes in student population, increase in student enrollment, increase in community support for their programs, increase in employment opportunities.

Additional Research Questions

The following discussion will address the major findings regarding the additional survey questions; 2 (b), 4 (a), (b), 8 (a), 9 (a), (b), (c), and 10 that were asked and were related to this study.

Survey question 2 (b) asked the respondents what best characterized their present student enrollment with regard to their program. Based on the data collected it was determined that moderate growth was being experienced by thirty-five percent of the programs surveyed.

However, forty-five percent of the program directors responded that no changes were taking place in student enrollment. Twenty percent of this study's respondents characterized their student enrollment as declining. None of the respondents indicated that their student enrollments were undergoing rapid growth.

The respondents who had reported that their programs were experiencing moderate growth in student enrollment attributed it to a combination of factors. The factors as previously reported by the respondents were attributed to: increases in population growth in their areas; job growth in their locales; and the offering of employer tuition reimbursement programs. The program directors also indicated that student enrollments were increasing because their programs were receiving community support and institutional support from their colleges.

However, those program directors that indicated that their student enrollments were declining reported that their loss of students was related to the change in the colleges' mission statements. Also, those program directors indicated there was a lack of community awareness or support for their programs and that their colleges were undergoing budget cuts.
Survey question 4 (a) asked the twenty program directors to indicate the emphasis of their program: entry-level employability, terminal degree purposes or upper division transfer purposes. All twenty program directors answered the question. The data collected regarding this question supports the finding that the associate degree in public administration is designed primarily for upper division transfer purposes. The data also indicated that associate degrees in public administration have been also designed with an emphasis for entry-level employability and terminal degree purposes.

The findings also showed that programs designed for upper-division transfer purposes generally award associate of arts degrees (A.A.). However, those programs that are designed for entry-level employability purposes or terminal degree purposes award associate of applied science (A.A.S.) or associate of science degrees (A.S.).

Survey question 4 (b) answered by all twenty respondents asked whether the majority of their students were employed full-time in public service related jobs while studying in their programs. Seventy-five percent of the program directors said that the majority of their students were not employed in full-time public service positions. Twenty-five percent of the respondents indicated that the majority of their students were working in full-time public service positions while enrolled in their programs. Program directors of colleges in Arizona and Texas reported that the reasons for their programs being attended by a majority of students who work full-time in public service positions was attributed to their campuses being in proximity to a military base or a city-county government complex. Also, those respondents indicated that the students’ employers were offering students tuition reimbursement coupled with career advancement incentive opportunities upon the students’ satisfactory completion of their degree programs. Based on the data collected for this study, the majority of students enrolled in associate degree programs in public administration do not work in full-time public service related positions.
Since no research has been conducted regarding the intentions of those students who are either working (in-service) or not working (pre-service) while enrolled in an associate degree program in public administration, one can only speculate. Those students who were working while attending school may have done so with the idea that they would be preparing themselves for advancement or they were preparing themselves for a career after their military service. Regarding the non-working students, several questions arise: 1) Were those non-working students younger in age than working students? 2) Were those non-working students planning to transfer to a four-year program? or 3) Were they preparing themselves for employment in a public service organization after their graduation with an associate degree in public administration?

With regard to survey question 8 (a), eighty percent of the twenty respondents indicated they had some form of an articulation process with one or more four-year colleges or universities that offer bachelor degrees in public administration. Twenty percent of the respondents reported that their programs did not have any form of an articulation agreement between a four-year college or university offering a bachelor's degree in public administration.

The respondents who stated that they had an articulation process indicated that their process was one of the following types of articulation agreements: a) in context of state policy or rule, b) interwritten agreements, c) informal process and d) in context of state policy and rules that are articulated through interwritten agreements. Based on the data collected there does not appear to be any uniformity or standardization of process governing articulation agreements between associate degree programs in public administration and bachelor degree programs in public administration.

According to Bana and Emory (1998) one of the challenges affecting community colleges that offer associate degree programs in public administration is the need to provide a "straightforward and seamless transfer program" (p. 225). As previously reported in this study, NASPAA in 1979 had developed "Guidelines For Community and Junior College Students Who Intend to Transfer
to Baccalaureate Degree Programs in Public Affairs/Public Administration." In those guidelines, specifically guideline 4.01, NASPAA addresses the subject of articulation. According to NASPAA, "... a successful transfer process depends upon effective articulation between the schools involved" (p. 7). Furthermore, NASPAA recommends in the 4.01 guideline that "A community or junior college should make articulation agreements with all four-year schools to which students normally transfer for their junior and senior years" (p. 7). Lastly, according to NASPAA "There should be a clear understanding about courses that are transferable and those that are not" (p. 7).

Eighty percent of the twenty respondents who answered survey question 9 (a) for this study indicated that they did not make use of information derived from NASPAA in developing their curriculum. Twenty percent reported that they did make use of information from NASPAA in developing their curriculum for their associate degree programs in public administration. The respondents that reported that they did not make use of NASPAA's curriculum guidelines did not provide any explanation as to whether they were aware of NASPAA's guidelines or why they had not communicated with NASPAA for resource assistance while developing their programs.

Guidelines are valuable in that they provide the user, in this case community colleges or junior colleges, with resource information, instruction and insights on how to develop something, i.e. a curriculum or program of study. Guidelines are also usually tied to certain standards and are uniform in nature. However, eighty percent of the twenty respondents for this study reported that they did not make use of NASPAA's guidelines when developing their curriculum. What is needed is to determine what level of communication, connectivity, or collaboration exists between NASPAA and community or junior colleges that offer associate degree programs in public administration.

Sixty percent of the respondents answering survey question 9 (b) indicated that their programs had mission statements. As previously reported, the researcher's review of these indicated that associate of arts degree programs in
public administration were located in either divisions or departments of social sciences or liberal arts and sciences. According to the mission statements of associate of arts degree programs, the primary purpose of their programs is to provide (pre-service) students without work experience with academic preparation for careers in public service and to provide a degree that can be used to transfer into an upper division program at a four-year college or university. Based on the review of those mission statements from those programs that offer an associate of science or applied science (terminal) degree in public administration, those degree programs are located in the business or professional and technical education departments of their college. The mission statements of terminal degree programs indicated that the primary purpose of their programs was to serve persons who are currently working in public sector positions along with providing academic preparation that will "improve and upgrade" their skills on the job. The mission statements also stated that their respective degree programs were intended to provide academic training for those students who are seeking entry-level employment in public sector organizations or non-profit agencies. According to the mission statements provided for this study, there is an apparent distinction as to the primary purposes of those colleges that confer either an associate of arts degree, an associate of science, or an associate of applied science degree in public administration.

The program directors were asked in survey question 10 to provide and offer key information that they believed would be helpful for a better understanding of their programs. Half the respondents provided such information. The information provided by the respondents ranged from a program director stating that his program was located in a business school, to another indicating that a public service ethics course was being introduced into their curriculum. Others described their particular situations. A program director indicated that her curriculum was being revised to include an infusion of skills that public employers want, i.e., problem solving skills. Another program director mentioned that her program was working to increase internship opportunities for students. Two
program directors reported that new faculty members were being hired to replace faculty members who were retiring.

In summary, the conclusions of the additional survey questions discussed are as follows. Associate degree programs in public administration offered by U.S. public community and junior colleges are designed primarily for upper division transfer purposes. The majority of students enrolled in such programs are full-time students and are not employed in full-time jobs. Eighty percent of this study's respondents reported that they have some kind of an articulation process with a four-year college or university that offers a bachelor degree in public administration. Eighty percent of the respondents also said that they did not use any information from NASPAA in developing their curriculum. Sixty percent of the program directors answered in the affirmative that their programs did have mission statements. Lastly, over half of the respondents stated that their programs did not have a community advisory board.

Implications and Conclusions

The results of this study provided new knowledge that has never been reported about associate degree programming in public administration. This study not only determined who is currently offering an associate degree in public administration but what types of degrees are being awarded. The results of this study revealed what departments or divisions in U.S. public community and junior colleges offer associate degree programs in public administration. This study's results also provided new information about what groups of the public sector are being primarily served by associate degree programs and in what kinds of public service occupational areas that graduates are finding employment with an associate degree in public administration. Furthermore, the results of this study offered new information about what curriculum subject areas are emphasized in associate degree programs in public administration and what changes are taking place in U.S. public community and junior colleges that offer an associate degree in public administration.
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The results lead to the following implications and conclusions related to the study's research questions and conceptual framework. This study indicates that programs located in high growth states such as Arizona and Texas have increased student enrollments, community support, institutional supports, and employment opportunities. Program directors reporting that their programs were undergoing a decline in student enrollments also reported that changes in mission statements, decreases in institutional financial support, and a decrease in employment opportunities were affecting their programs.

What does this mean? In order to begin, maintain and have a successful program or school in public affairs and administration, Short (1958) and Stone and Stone (1975) pointed out certain external and internal support factors must be present. The authors contend that a successful program is dependant upon effective leadership receiving sufficient funding and having political, community and institutional support. However, if a program is subjected to decreased funding, or is not receiving institutional support and there is a lack of a political, economic and community support base for the program and college it can cause program recession or a program to be discontinued.

This study's findings indicate that the curriculum subject areas emphasized in associate degree programs in public administration are very similar to the core competencies that are identified in bachelor degree programs in public administration and in National Association of Schools for Public Affairs and Administration's (NASPAA) 4.0 curriculum standards for accreditation of master of public administration degree programs. There may be a consensus regarding core competencies in public administration even though only (20%) of this study's respondents made use of information from NASPAA when developing their course requirements.

The fact that there are similarities in course requirements for associate degree programming in public administration, bachelor degree programming in public administration and for master public administration degree programming makes it apparent that an overlap in the curriculum exists among these
programs. This overlap in curriculum is especially evident in associate of science and associate of applied science (terminal) public administration degree programs, but not in associate of arts (transfer) programs in public administration. The reason for the lack of a curriculum overlap in the associate of arts programs is because those programs only require one or two public administration courses and not a core of courses in public administration. Also, associate of arts degree programs are usually designed for upper division transfer purposes. Furthermore, associate of arts degree programs require that students complete a core of general education courses that are linked to articulation agreements with four-year colleges or universities that offer a B.A. degree program.

However, associate of science degree programs in North Carolina, Arizona and Texas require that their students complete four "common core" courses in public administration that accounts for twelve to eighteen semester hours of their sixty to seventy-six semester hours of their degree program. The required public administration core courses of those associate of science degree programs mirror and are very similar in course description and content to those "core courses" required of students that are enrolled in bachelor degree or master degree programs in public administration.

For example, a North Carolina community college that participated in this study requires fifteen semester hours or five "core courses" in public administration. The student is required to complete the following five "core courses": Introduction to Public Administration, Ethics in Government, Public Finance and Budgeting, Public Policy Analysis and Introduction to Urban Planning in order to graduate with an associate in applied science degree in public administration. Another common core of the associate degree program is a course in human resource management. After comparing a Florida University's required "core courses" for its bachelor and master degree programs in public administration to "core courses" required in associate of science degree programs in public administration at North Carolina, Arizona, and Texas
community colleges, it can be said that an overlap in the curriculum does exist across the curriculum of associate in applied science, bachelor and master degree programs in public administration.

The implications of the curriculum overlap finding presents the possibility that there is a triple redundancy in public administration educational programming at the associate, bachelor, and master degree levels in public administration education. This apparent triple redundancy is evident as previously discussed when comparing core courses to degree requirements of associate of science, associate of applied science in public administration with the bachelors degree, masters degree core course and degree requirements. This finding suggests that a person who earns an associate of science, a bachelors degree and a master degree in public administration may end up repeating much of the same course materials. That person also may not be as well prepared if they had graduated with a bachelors degree in liberal arts, social sciences or in technical areas like environmental studies, accounting or civil engineering. (W.E. Klay, personal communication, November 7, 2004).

The masters degree in public administration is considered to be a professional degree. NASPAA is the accreditation body for public administration education at the masters degree level. NASPAA requires that master degree programs seeking accreditation are to meet certain standards regarding course offering and degree requirements. Just like other professional degree programs (i.e., law; masters degree programs in public administration desires its applicants to come from diverse undergraduate degree backgrounds because its believed that the public service is enhanced by students with varied educational backgrounds. (W.E. Klay, personal communication, November 7, 2004). The leaders and standard setters of NASPAA, those in the field of public administration need to address the triple redundancy issue and its impacts upon bachelors degree programs and accredited master degree programs in public administration.
United States public community colleges and junior colleges are considered to epitomize the idea of providing mass education to diverse student populations. However, the irony is that this study’s findings indicated that there are only twenty associate degree programs being offered in only fifteen states in the U.S. public community colleges and junior colleges.

This finding suggests that public administration education that is offered by U.S. public community colleges and junior colleges can be characterized as being a form of elite education because of the limited availability and access for students to be able to enroll into an associate degree program in public administration. What is startling about those findings are that there are numbers of public service employers in the U.S. that are in need of “mass” public administration education at the associate degree level. It appears that public administration education is being left to non-credit programming (i.e., certified public manager programs that have resulted from in-house human resource management initiatives.).

These issues need to be addressed by NASPAA and other standard setters in the field which had become apparent from this studies findings are:

1) Why has associate degree programming in public administration been developed somewhat in isolation from NASPAA and from universities in which articulation is done?

2) Why have only twenty community colleges in the U.S. out of 1,081 U.S. public community colleges and junior colleges perceived there is a market for an associate degree in public administration?

In conclusion, if a student is awarded an A.A. degree then that student is prepared to transfer to a four-year institution and the student will not experience a curriculum overlap. However, the associate of science degree programs in Public Administration are designed as a terminal degree leading to immediate employment. Therefore, those terminal degree students that choose to continue later for a bachelor’s degree will need to take general education courses at a four-year college or university. Also, those students undoubtedly will have to
repeat public administration courses. It is evident that the curriculum overlap is a problem for the four-year institutions rather than the community colleges since they are clear about the purposes and differences between the A.A. and A.S. degrees. The repeating of courses is actually more of a problem for those students who hold an A.S. degree.

Another significant finding of this study as reported is the fact that eighty percent of the twenty respondents indicated that they did not utilize information from NASPAA when they developed their program. This finding begs the following question: why did only four respondents utilize information from NASPAA where as the other sixteen program directors did not? The present study revealed that in 1979, NASPAA developed curriculum guidelines for community and junior college students who intended to transfer to bachelor degree programs in public administration.

Bana and Emory's 1998 article reviewed for this study was the first article to be written that reported on community college programming in public administration. The article is a descriptive, reflective and generalized restatement report rather than a research study. The article was based on information that was primarily derived from the 1995 edition of the *College Bluebook*. The authors reported about the general role and responsibilities of community colleges, community college students, types of degrees, programs, and courses offered in public administration and how many degrees in public administration were awarded in 1995. The authors also reported about a community college's experience in implementing a certificate program in public administration.

Bana and Emory (1998) concluded that: 1) community colleges are often not considered as a place to study and earn a degree in public administration, 2) a "straight forward and seamless transfer program" must be provided for community college students who transfer to upper division four-year colleges and universities. (p. 225), 3) there is a need for finding appropriate resource materials in the form of textbooks, journals, databases, and support materials, and 4) the community college is the place where "the vast cadre of operation-level public
employees" can be provided with entry-level public administration educational training. (p. 225).

NASPAA’s website in 2002 listed 28 community colleges in seventeen states that offered associate degree programs in public administration. The 1995 edition of the *College Bluebook* was cited by NASPAA as its reference source for its listing. NASPAA’s website was reviewed on June 30, 2005 and it does not mention or list any data about associate degree programs in public administration that are offered by either private or public U.S. community and junior colleges. This study has determined that information relating to community college public administration education is outdated and that there are gaps and conflicting information about associate degree programming in public administration.

The research findings from this study can provide NASPAA with a current listing of U.S. public community and junior colleges that are in fact awarding associate degrees in public administration. This study provides new comprehensive data about: 1) what curriculum subject areas are emphasized in associate degree programming and public administration, 2) what groups of the public sector are being primarily served by graduates with associate degrees in public administration, 3) the kinds of public service positions that are held by graduates with an associate degree in public administration, and 4) what changes are taking place in associate degree programs in public administration. This new information could compel NASPAA leadership, especially at the undergraduate committee level, to open new lines of communication which will enable NASPAA to connect and collaborate with those community college program directors that administer associate degree programs in public administration.

This study’s results indicated that there are jobs that require an associate degree in public administration and graduates with that degree are working certain kinds of jobs in both the private and public sector of the U.S. labor market. However, this study did not examine the economic value of graduation with an associate degree in public administration compared to graduation with a
bachelor’s in public administration. The study also did not address the issue whether there is a job ceiling for those working with an associate degree in public administration.

In conclusion, public administration educational programming is taking place in fifteen states in twenty U.S. public community and junior colleges. Those colleges award associate degrees (A.A., A.S., A.A.S.) in public administration. Graduates from those colleges are finding jobs and are working in public and private sectors in the U.S. labor market. There are also certain changes that are affecting the present and future status of associate degree programming in public administration i.e., growth in student enrollment, new courses introduced into associate degree programs in public administration, and decreases in institutional funding.

Finally, NASPAA should take into account and utilize the data from this study and make it part of their database so that it can be accessed for reference, research, and evaluation purposes by researchers, instructors, administrators, practitioners, and students that are involved in public administration education in the U.S. and world wide.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study’s research questions have been answered. The three factors of this study’s conceptual framework: division of labor, articulation and accreditation were examined and discussed based on the data results of this study. Further research could be conducted, by using this study’s research questions, conceptual framework, and survey research instrument, to examine the status of private community colleges and junior colleges that offer associate degrees in public administration with respect to what subjects are emphasized in their programs. The results of that research could provide a more comprehensive description of U.S. community and junior college associate degree programming in public administration.

There are graduates with associate degrees in public administration that are working in jobs in the private and public sectors of the U.S. labor market.
Another recommendation for future research in associate degree programming in public administration is needed to determine the entry-level employability, the economic value, and the job ceiling for someone that has earned that degree.

Finally, by utilizing Stone and Stone's (1975) algebraic formula, that was discussed in this study, future research could be conducted to assess the capability and survival potential of U.S. community and junior college programs that offer associate degree programs in public administration.
APPENDIX A

U.S. PUBLIC COMMUNITY/JUNIOR COLLEGE
ASSOCIATE DEGREE PROGRAMS IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
SURVEY RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Name of college: ____________________________________________

2. a. How many students are enrolled in your programs?
   i. 766 full time
   ii. 344 part-time

   b. What best characterizes your present enrollment for your program?
   i. 0% rapid growth
   ii. 35% moderate growth
   iii. 45% no change
   iv. 20% declining

3. How many full-time faculty members teach substantially in your program?

4. a. What is the emphasis of your program? Check all that apply:
   i. 0% entry-level employability
   ii. 0% terminal degree purposes
   iii. 40% upper division transfer purpose
   iv. 5% i. & ii.
   v. 5% ii. & iii.
   vi. 25% i., ii., & iii.
   vii. 25% i. & iii.

   b. Are the majority of your students employed full time in public service-related jobs concurrently with their studies in your program?
   25% Yes
   75% No

5. Please refer to the following definitions when responding to 5a., i - x: Slight = occasional mention of the topic in one or more courses; Moderate = total coverage equivalent to two or more weeks of a standard three-semester credit (or equivalent) course; Substantial = total coverage equivalent to half or more of the subject matter of a three-semester credit (or equivalent) course.
a. How much emphasis does your program place on each of the following: Check where applicable.
   
i. Political and legal institutions and processes
   0% none 36.84% slight 10.53% moderate 52.63% substantial

   ii. Economic and social institutions and processes
   0% none 5.26% slight 68.42% moderate 26.32% substantial

   iii. Organization and management concepts and behavior
   5.26% none 10.53% slight 36.84% moderate 47.37% substantial

   iv. Supervisory skills
   10.52% none 26.32% slight 36.84% moderate 26.32% substantial

   v. Policy and program formulation, implementation and evaluation
   0% none 31.58% slight 47.37% moderate 21.05% substantial

   vi. Decision-making and problem-solving
   5.26% none 21.05% slight 26.32% moderate 47.3% substantial

   vii. Human resources
   5.26% none 26.32% slight 36.84% moderate 31.58% substantial

   viii. Budgeting and financial processes
   0% none 36.84% slight 10.53% moderate 52.63% substantial

   ix. Information resources, including computer literacy and applications
   5.26% none 21.05% slight 31.58% moderate 42.11% substantial

   x. Management of non-profit organizations
   26.32% none 47.36% slight 26.32% moderate 0% substantial

b. Does your program offer students “on-line” distance learning opportunities?
   57% Yes (11) If yes, check the following that apply:
   n/a some courses n/a total degree program

   43% No (8)

6. In which of the following areas are substantial numbers of your graduates employed? Check all that apply. n = 18
   7 direct service delivery
   6 human resources staff
   6 financial
   2 informational/computer
   4 planning/policy development
   10 other
7. a. Approximately what percentage of your graduates are employed in public service jobs following graduation? 60.7%

b. Approximately what percentage of your graduates supervise others? 33 avg. %

c. In your best estimate, approximately what percentage of your employed graduates are working in the following:
   i. 6.06% federal government
   ii. 25.75% state government
   iii. 29.75% local government
   iv. 12.06% not-for-profit organizations
   v. 26.38% other

8. a. Does your associate degree program have an articulation process with one or more 4-year college(s) or university that offers a bachelor’s degree in public administration?
   i. 80% Yes
   ii. 20% No

b. If yes, what kind of agreement? Please check ( ) all that apply:
   i. articulated in context of state policy/rule(s) 5
   ii. articulated through inter-written agreements 4
   iii. informally 3
   iv. i. & ii. 4

9. a. In developing your curriculum did you make use of information derived from the National Association of Schools for Public Affairs and Administration?
   20% Yes
   80% No

b. Does your program have a mission statement?
   60% Yes If yes, please include a copy with your of this Survey.
   40% No

c. Does your program have a community advisory board?
   40% Yes 60% No

   If yes, what function(s) do they serve? consultative, collaborative

10. a. Is your program undergoing change(s)?
   85% Yes 15% No
Which of the following factors are related to the change(s)? Please ( ) all that apply.

i. Changes in mission = *1 of 15 respondents (r’s)
ii. Increase in student enrollment = 7 r’s
iii. Decrease in student enrollment = 4 r’s
iv. Increase in employment opportunities = 5 r’s
v. Decrease in employment opportunities = 1 r
vi. Demographic changes in student population = 8 r’s
vii. Increase in institutional financial support for your program
viii. Decrease in institutional financial support for program
ix. Increase in community support for program
x. Decrease in community support for program

* n=15

b. Is there other key information about your associate degree program that is not addressed and which you believe would be helpful for better understanding of your program? If so, please explain.  n = 10

Program located in business school, introduction of an ethics course in curriculum, curriculum revision taken place in one program, expansion of internship opportunities, and faculty retirements.

Completed by:

Name:_______________________________
Title:________________________________
Date:________________________________
Telephone: __________________________
E-mail:______________________________

Would you like to have the results of the Survey?

Yes 20  No ______
Listed below are the states and the names of the 20 public community and junior colleges in the U.S. offering associate degree programs in public administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>Prima Community College&lt;br&gt;Rio Salado Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>Palomar College&lt;br&gt;Southwest College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Three Rivers Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Manatee Community College&lt;br&gt;Tallahassee Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Middle Georgia College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>Barton Community College&lt;br&gt;Hutchinson Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Hinds Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Jefferson Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Country College of Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Fayetteville Technical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Sinclair Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>Community College of Allegheny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>San Antonio College&lt;br&gt;San Jacinto Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>Thomas Nelson Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Laramie County Community College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Questionnaire Responses to Niches and Groups Primarily Served by Associate Degree Programs in Public Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Federal Govt. %</th>
<th>State Govt. %</th>
<th>Local Govt. %</th>
<th>Non Profit %</th>
<th>Other %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
HUMAN SUBJECTS COMMITTEE APPROVAL

Florida State University
Office of the Vice President
for Research
Tallahassee, Florida 32306-2763
(850) 644-7900 • FAX (850) 644-6392

REAPPROVAL MEMORANDUM
from the Human Subjects Committee

Date: October 18, 2002
From: David Quadagno, Chairperson
To: Steven R. Maxwell
P. O. Box 805
Sanibel, FL 33957
Dept: Higher Education
Re: Reapproval of Use of Human Subjects in Research
Project entitled: Associate Degree Programs of Public Administration In United States Public Community Colleges and Junior Colleges

Your request to continue the research project listed above involving human subjects has been approved by the Human Subjects Committee. If your project has not been completed by July 1, 2003, please request renewed approval.

You are reminded that a change in protocol in this project must be approved by resubmission of the project to the Committee for approval. Also, the principal investigator must report to the Chair promptly, and in writing, any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the Chairman of your department and/or your major professor are reminded of their responsibility for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in their department. They are advised to review the protocols of such investigations as often as necessary to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our Institution and with DHHS regulations.

cc: Dr. Barbara Mann
human/renewal hs
APPLICATION NO. 02.541-R
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